

UNIVERSALITY FOR THE LARGEST EIGENVALUE OF A CLASS OF SAMPLE COVARIANCE MATRICES

ZHIGANG BAO, GUANGMING PAN, AND WANG ZHOU

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we will derive the universality of the largest eigenvalue of a class of real or complex large dimensional sample covariance matrices in the form of $\mathcal{W}_N = \Sigma^{1/2} X X^* \Sigma^{1/2}$. Here $X = (x_{ij})_{M,N}$ is an $M \times N$ random matrix with independent entries x_{ij} , $1 \leq i \leq M, 1 \leq j \leq N$ such that $\mathbb{E}x_{ij} = 0$, $\mathbb{E}|x_{ij}|^2 = 1/N$. We say $\mathcal{W}_N$ is a classical complex sample covariance matrix if there also exists $\mathbb{E}x_{ij}^2 = 0$, $1 \leq i \leq M, 1 \leq j \leq N$. Moreover, on dimensions we assume that $M = M(N)$ and $N/M \rightarrow d \in (0, \infty)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. For a class of deterministic positive definite $M \times M$ matrix Σ , we show that the limiting behavior of the largest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{W}_N$ is universal under some additional assumptions on the distributions of (x_{ij}) 's by pursuing a Green function comparison strategy raised in [21, 22] by Erdős, Yau and Yin for Wigner matrices and extended by Pillai and Yin [30] to sample covariance matrices in the null case ($\Sigma = I$). Consequently, in the classical complex case, combining this universality property and the results known for Gaussian case derived by El Karoui in [10] (nonsingular case) and Onatski in [28] (singular case) we show that after appropriate normalization the largest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{W}_N$ converges weakly to the type 2 Tracy-Widom distribution TW_2 . Moreover, it is straightforward to extend our argument to establish the universality for the limiting joint distribution of the largest k eigenvalues of $\mathcal{W}_N$ with any fixed positive integer k .

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, researchers working on multivariate analysis have a growing interest in large dimensional data arising from various fields such as genomics, image processing, microarray, proteomics and finance, to name but a few. Consequently, the spectral analysis of large dimensional sample covariance matrices has attracted considerable interest among mathematicians, probabilists and statisticians. The study towards the eigenvalues of sample covariance matrices traces back to the work of Hsu [23], and became flourishing after the seminal work of Marčenko and Pastur [27]. In [27], the authors raised the limiting spectral distribution (MP type distribution) for a class of sample covariance matrices. After that, a lot of researchers took part in developing the asymptotic theory of the empirical spectral distribution of large dimensional sample covariance matrices, one can refer to [5, 9, 38] for instance.

Date: May 24, 2013.

Key words and phrases. sample covariance matrices, edge universality, Tracy-Widom law.

Z.G. Bao was partially supported by NSFC grant 11071213, ZJNSF grant R6090034 and SRFDP grant 20100101110001; G.M. Pan was partially supported by the Ministry of Education, Singapore, under grant # ARC 14/11; W. Zhou was partially supported by the Ministry of Education, Singapore, under grant # ARC 14/11, and by a grant R-155-000-116-112 at the National University of Singapore.

In this paper, we will focus on the limiting behavior of the largest eigenvalues of a class of large dimensional sample covariance matrices. Precisely, we will consider the sample covariance matrix in the form of

$$\mathcal{W}_N = \Sigma^{1/2} X X^* \Sigma^{1/2}, \quad X = (x_{ij})_{M,N}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\{x_{ij} := x_{ij}(N), 1 \leq i \leq M := M(N), 1 \leq j \leq N\}$ is a collection of independent real or complex variables such that

$$\mathbb{E}x_{ij} = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}|x_{ij}|^2 = \frac{1}{N}.$$

Moreover, we say $\mathcal{W}_N$ is a classical complex sample covariance matrix if there also exists

$$\mathbb{E}x_{ij}^2 = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq M, 1 \leq j \leq N.$$

Here $\Sigma := \Sigma_N$ is an $M \times M$ positive definite matrix. Thus if the columns of X are i.i.d, $\mathcal{W}_N$ can be viewed as the sample covariance matrix of N samples of the random vector $\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{x}$, where $\mathbf{x}$ is a random vector which has the same distribution as each column of $\sqrt{N}X$. We call $\mathcal{W}_N$ is a Wishart matrix if (x_{ij}) 's are Gaussian.

As is well known, the limiting distributions of the largest eigenvalues for classical large dimensional random matrices were originally raised by Tracy and Widom in [36, 37] for Gaussian Wigner ensemble $G(O/U/S)E$, thus are named as Tracy-Widom law of type β ($\beta=1,2,4$ for GOE, GUE, GSE respectively) which will be denoted by TW_β hereafter. Later on, in [25] Johansson proved that when $\mathcal{W}_N$ in (1.1) is a classical complex Wishart matrix in the null case ($\Sigma = I_M$), after appropriate normalization the largest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{W}_N$ converges to TW_2 weakly. After that, Johnstone solved the real Wishart case in [26] and show that when $\Sigma = I_M$, the largest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{W}_N$ converges to TW_1 weakly after appropriate normalization.

For the non-null case ($\Sigma \neq I_M$), most works have been devoted to deal with the so called spiked model. We say $\mathcal{W}_N$ is spiked when there are finite number of eigenvalues of Σ not equal to 1. On spiked Wishart model, one can refer to [6] and [8] for classical complex and real case respectively. Under more general setting of Σ , the most relevant result was given by El Karoui in [10] for classical complex non-null Wishart matrices with a general assumption on Σ when $d > 1$ (nonsingular case), and extended by Onatski to the singular case ($0 < d \leq 1$) in [28] later.

Note that all the results mentioned above are particularly for the Gaussian matrices. A central issue in Random Matrix Theory is the so called universality property for spectrum statistics. That means, the limiting behavior of an eigenvalue statistic usually does not depend on the details of the distribution of the matrix entries thus should hold under more general distribution assumption (but not particularly for Gaussian variables). The universality problem of the extreme eigenvalues are usually refer to as the edge universality problem, in contrast to the so called bulk universality problem which concerns the universal properties of the eigenvalues lying in the bulk of the spectrum. Specifically, for sample covariance matrices, in the null case, Tracy-Widom law for the extreme eigenvalues of Wishart matrices has been extended to more general distributed $\mathcal{W}_N$, one can see [33, 29, 39, 30] for instance. For

generally distributed spiked sample covariance matrices, the universality property was also partially solved in [4] and [24].

In this paper, we will prove the universality of the largest eigenvalues of a class of non-null $\mathcal{W}_N$ under a general setting on Σ which is analogous to those in [10] and [28]. A direct consequence of such a universality property and the results in [10] and [28] is that the TW_2 law also holds for generally distributed classical complex $\mathcal{W}_N$ under our setting on Σ . This work can be viewed as a generalization of the edge universality in the null case ($\Sigma = I$) provided by Pillai and Yin in [30] to a class of non-null sample covariance matrices. In the sequel, we will present our main results and introduce some notations at first. And after that, we will give an introduction of the proof route which relies on a Green function comparison strategy raised by Erdős, Yau and Yin in [21, 22] for Wigner matrices originally and extended by Pillai and Yin [30] to sample covariance matrices in the null case.

To state our results, we introduce some notations at first. In the sequel, we will denote the ordered eigenvalues of an $n \times n$ Hermitian matrix A by

$$\lambda_n(A) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_2(A) \leq \lambda_1(A). \quad (1.2)$$

For ease of presentation, we set

$$d_N := \frac{N}{M} \rightarrow d \in (0, \infty), \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

We denote the empirical spectral distribution (ESD) of Σ by

$$H_N(\lambda) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{1}_{\{\lambda_i(\Sigma) \leq \lambda\}}$$

and that of $\mathcal{W}_N$ by

$$\underline{E}_N(\lambda) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{1}_{\{\lambda_i(\mathcal{W}) \leq \lambda\}}.$$

Here $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{S}}$ represents the indicator function of the event $\mathbb{S}$.

To state our main result, we need to introduce a crucial parameter $\mathbf{c} =: \mathbf{c}(\Sigma, N, M)$. Let

$$\mathbf{c} := \mathbf{c}(\Sigma, N, M), \quad \mathbf{c} \in [0, 1/\lambda_1(\Sigma)),$$

such that

$$\int \left(\frac{\lambda \mathbf{c}}{1 - \lambda \mathbf{c}} \right)^2 dH_N(\lambda) = d_N. \quad (1.3)$$

It is easy to check that the definition of $\mathbf{c}$ is unique. Now we can state our main condition as follows.

Condition 1.1. *Throughout the paper, we will need the following conditions.*

(i)(On dimensions): We assume that there are some positive constants c_1 and C_1 such that

$$c_1 < d_N < C_1.$$

(ii)(On X): We assume that $\{x_{ij} := x_{ij}(N), 1 \leq i \leq M, 1 \leq j \leq N\}$ is a collection of independent real or complex variables such that

$$\mathbb{E}x_{ij} = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}|x_{ij}|^2 = \frac{1}{N}.$$

Moreover, we assume that $\sqrt{N}x_{ij}$'s have a sub-exponential tail, i.e. there exists some positive constant τ_0 independent of i, j, N such that for sufficiently large t , one has

$$\mathbb{P}(|\sqrt{N}x_{ij}| \geq t) \leq \tau_0^{-1} \exp(-t^{\tau_0}). \quad (1.4)$$

(iii)(On Σ): We assume that

$$\liminf_N \lambda_M(\Sigma) > 0, \quad \limsup_N \lambda_1(\Sigma) < \infty$$

and

$$\limsup_N \lambda_1(\Sigma) \mathbf{c} < 1. \quad (1.5)$$

Moreover, we assume that there is a definite probability distribution function $H(\lambda)$ such that

$$H_N(\lambda) \implies H(\lambda), \quad N \rightarrow \infty.$$

And we will also need the following terminology.

Definition 1.2 (Matching to order k). Let $X^{\mathbf{u}} = (x_{ij}^{\mathbf{u}})_{M,N}$ and $X^{\mathbf{v}} = (x_{ij}^{\mathbf{v}})_{M,N}$ be two matrices satisfying (ii) of Condition 1.1. We say $X^{\mathbf{u}}$ matches $X^{\mathbf{v}}$ to order k if for all $1 \leq i \leq M, 1 \leq j \leq N$ and nonnegative integers l, m with $l + m \leq k$, there exists

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}(\Re(\sqrt{N}x_{ij}^{\mathbf{u}})^l \Im(\sqrt{N}x_{ij}^{\mathbf{u}})^m) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\Re(\sqrt{N}x_{ij}^{\mathbf{v}})^l \Im(\sqrt{N}x_{ij}^{\mathbf{v}})^m) + O(e^{-(\log N)^C}) \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

with some positive constant $C > 1$. Moreover, if (1.6) holds, we also say that $\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{u}}$ matches $\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}$ to order k , where

$$\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{u}} = \Sigma^{1/2} X^{\mathbf{u}} (X^{\mathbf{u}})^* \Sigma^{1/2}, \quad \mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}} = \Sigma^{1/2} X^{\mathbf{v}} (X^{\mathbf{v}})^* \Sigma^{1/2}.$$

Under Condition 1.1, we can state our main results.

Theorem 1.3 (Universality for both real and complex cases). Let $\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{u}} = \Sigma^{1/2} X^{\mathbf{u}} (X^{\mathbf{u}})^* \Sigma^{1/2}$ and $\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}} = \Sigma^{1/2} X^{\mathbf{v}} (X^{\mathbf{v}})^* \Sigma^{1/2}$ be two sample covariance matrices satisfying Condition 1.1, where $X^{\mathbf{u}} := (x_{ij}^{\mathbf{u}})_{M,N}$ and $X^{\mathbf{v}} := (x_{ij}^{\mathbf{v}})_{M,N}$. Let

$$\lambda_r = \frac{1}{\mathbf{c}} \left(1 + d_N^{-1} \int \frac{\lambda \mathbf{c}}{1 - \lambda \mathbf{c}} dH_N(\lambda) \right). \quad (1.7)$$

Then for any real number s which may depend on N , there exist some positive constants $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(N^{2/3}(\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{u}}) - \lambda_r) \leq s - N^{-\epsilon}) - N^{-\delta} \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(N^{2/3}(\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}) - \lambda_r) \leq s) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(N^{2/3}(\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{u}}) - \lambda_r) \leq s + N^{-\epsilon}) + N^{-\delta} \end{aligned} \quad (1.8)$$

if one of the following two additional conditions holds,

A: Σ is diagonal and $\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{u}}$ matches $\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}$ to order 2.

B: $\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{u}}$ matches $\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}$ to order 4.

Remark 1.4. Actually, we can analogously derive the universality property for the joint distribution of the largest k eigenvalues of $\mathcal{W}_N$ for any fixed k . That means, under Condition 1.1 and the additional assumption **A** or **B**, the following extension of (1.8)

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(N^{2/3}(\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{u}}) - \lambda_r) \leq s_1 - N^{-\epsilon}, \dots, N^{2/3}(\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{u}}) - \lambda_r) \leq s_k - N^{-\epsilon}) - N^{-\delta} \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(N^{2/3}(\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}) - \lambda_r) \leq s_1, \dots, N^{2/3}(\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}) - \lambda_r) \leq s_k) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(N^{2/3}(\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{u}}) - \lambda_r) \leq s + N^{-\epsilon}, \dots, N^{2/3}(\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{u}}) - \lambda_r) \leq s_k + N^{-\epsilon}) + N^{-\delta} \end{aligned}$$

holds for any real numbers $s_1, \dots, s_k$ when N is sufficiently large.

Combining Theorem 1.3 with Theorem 1 of [10] and Proposition 2 of [28] we see that in the classical complex case ($\mathbb{E}x_{ij}^2 = 0$), the following more concrete result holds.

Theorem 1.5 (Tracy-Widom limit for classical complex case). *Let $\mathcal{W}_N^{\mathbf{g}}$ be a classical complex Wishart matrix and $\mathcal{W}_N$ be a general classical complex sample covariance matrix and both of them satisfy Condition 1.1. We have*

$$N^{2/3} \left(\frac{\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_N) - \lambda_r}{\sigma} \right) \Longrightarrow TW_2$$

if either Σ is diagonal or $\mathcal{W}_N$ matches $\mathcal{W}_N^{\mathbf{g}}$ to order 4. Here

$$\sigma^3 = \frac{1}{\mathbf{c}^3} \left(1 + d_N^{-1} \int \left(\frac{\lambda \mathbf{c}}{1 - \lambda \mathbf{c}} \right)^3 dH_N(\lambda) \right).$$

Remark 1.6. Correspondingly, we also have that the joint distribution of

$$\left(\frac{\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_N) - \lambda_r}{\sigma}, \dots, \frac{\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}_N) - \lambda_r}{\sigma} \right)$$

converges weakly to the k -dimensional joint TW_2

Below we will give a brief explanation on the choice of the parameter $\mathbf{c}$ and meanwhile some crucial concepts will also be introduced. With these concepts we will present the route of our proof later. Define the $N \times N$ matrix

$$W_N := X^* \Sigma X$$

which shares the same non-zero eigenvalues with $\mathcal{W}_N$.

Denote the ESD of W_N by F_N , then it is elementary to see

$$F_N(\lambda) = d_N^{-1} \underline{F}_N(\lambda) + (1 - d_N^{-1}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\lambda \geq 0\}}.$$

When there is some definite distribution H such that

$$H_N \Longrightarrow H \tag{1.9}$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$, it is well known that there are definite distributions $F_{d,H}$ and $\underline{F}_{d,H}$ such that

$$F_N \Longrightarrow F_{d,H}, \quad \underline{F}_N \Longrightarrow \underline{F}_{d,H}$$

in probability. And we have the relation

$$F_{d,H} = d^{-1} \underline{F}_{d,H} + (1 - d^{-1}) \mathbf{1}_{[0,\infty)}. \quad (1.10)$$

For any distribution function D , its Stieltjes transform $m_D(z)$ is defined by

$$m_D(z) = \int \frac{1}{\lambda - z} dD(\lambda)$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+ := \{\omega \in \mathbb{C}, \Im \omega > 0\}$. And for any square matrix A , its Green function is defined by

$$G_A(z) = (A - zI)^{-1}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

For simplicity, we denote

$$m(z) := m_{F_{d,H}}(z), \quad \underline{m}(z) := m_{\underline{F}_{d,H}}(z), \quad m_N(z) := m_{F_N}(z), \quad \underline{m}_N(z) := m_{\underline{F}_N}(z).$$

For general Σ , $F_{d,H}$ usually has no closed form expression. Fortunately, the Stieltjes transform of $F_{d,H}$ admits a self-consistent equation. Actually $m(z)$ is the unique solution in $\mathbb{C}^+$ of the self-consistence equation

$$m(z) = \frac{1}{-z + d^{-1} \int \frac{t}{tm(z)+1} dH(t)}$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. From (1.10) we have

$$m(z) = \frac{d^{-1} - 1}{z} + d^{-1} \underline{m}(z).$$

However, what we need in the sequel is the non-asymptotic version of $F_{d,H}$ which can be obtained through replacing d and H by d_N and H_N in $F_{d,H}$ and thus will be denoted by F_{d_N,H_N} . More precisely, F_{d_N,H_N} is the corresponding distribution function of the Stieltjes transform $m_{d_N,H_N}(z) := m_{F_{d_N,H_N}}(z) \in \mathbb{C}^+$ satisfying the following self-consistent equation

$$m_{d_N,H_N}(z) = \frac{1}{-z + d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t}{tm_{d_N,H_N}(z)+1} dH_N(t)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+. \quad (1.11)$$

In other words, by the inverse formula of Stieltjes transform, we can define

$$F_{d_N,H_N}(x) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x < 0, \\ \mathbf{1}_{\{d_N \geq 1\}}(1 - d_N^{-1}), & \text{if } x = 0, \\ \mathbf{1}_{\{d_N \geq 1\}}(1 - d_N^{-1}) + \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^x \Im m_{d_N,H_N}(t + i\eta) dt, & \text{if } x > 0. \end{cases}$$

Correspondingly, we can define the non asymptotic versions of $\underline{F}_{d,H}$ and $\underline{m}(z)$ denoted by $\underline{F}_{d_N,H_N}$ and $\underline{m}_{d_N,H_N}(z)$ respectively. For ease of notation, we will briefly denote

$$m_0(z) := m_{d_N,H_N}(z), \quad \underline{m}_0(z) := \underline{m}_{d_N,H_N}(z), \quad F_0 := F_{d_N,H_N}, \quad \underline{F}_0 := \underline{F}_{d_N,H_N}$$

in the sequel. By definition, we have

$$m_0(z) = \frac{d_N^{-1} - 1}{z} + d_N^{-1} \underline{m}_0(z).$$

Moreover, the relation above still holds if we replace $m_0(z)$ and $\underline{m}_0(z)$ by $m_N(z)$ and $\underline{m}_N(z)$ respectively.

By discussions in [32] we can learn that F_0 has a continuous derivative ρ_0 on $\mathbb{R} - \{0\}$. Actually, by Lemma 6.2 of [3], it is not difficult to see the rightmost boundary of the support of ρ_0 is λ_r defined in (1.7), i.e.

$$\lambda_r = \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : F_0(x) = 1\}.$$

Moreover, there exists

$$\mathbf{c} = - \lim_{z \in \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow \lambda_r} m_0(z).$$

The existence of $\lim_{z \in \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow x} m_0(z)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ has been proved in [32].

Our main result Theorem 1.3 can be viewed as a generalization of the edge universality for sample covariance matrices in the null case provided in [30] by Pillai and Yin to a large class of non null cases. In [30], the authors adopt a Green function comparison strategy which was raised in [21] and [22] for Wigner matrices originally. Such a strategy will also be adopted in our non-null case. The Green function comparison strategy relies on a strong law of local eigenvalue density which asserts that the limiting spectral law is even valid on short intervals which contain only N^ε eigenvalues for any constant $\varepsilon > 0$. Such a limiting law on microscopic scales was developed in a serious works [15, 16, 17, 22] for Wigner matrices originally and was shown to be crucial in recent works on universality problems of local eigenvalue statistics, one can refer to [18, 21, 34] and the survey paper [11] for instance. Moreover, such type of results are not only inputs of the Green function comparison strategy but also of interest in their own right. The main route in [21, 22, 30] can be summarized into the following two steps.

- 1: Deriving a strong law of local eigenvalue density.
- 2: Establishing a Green function comparison theorem.

Roughly speaking, step 2 can lead one to the final universality result and step 1 is the main technical input to fulfill step 2 in this two steps strategy. In the sequel, we will sketch the main ideas of the Green function comparison strategy and give a short review on the local eigenvalue density problems developed in the previous works at first. And then, we will sketch the main difficulties and the corresponding methods to conquer them in the process of pursuing such a strategy for our model.

•: *Green function comparison strategy*

The main idea of the Green function comparison strategy is that when we want to show the universality of a statistic of some random matrix ensemble, at first we

need to represent the target statistic in terms of some functional of the Green function or sometime just the Stieltjes transform of the random matrix. Then we can use the classical Lindeberg swapping strategy to compare the distributions of the functional of the Green functions of two matrices. Owing to the simplicity of the Green function expansion formula, such a comparison strategy is usually effective. This strategy was raised in [20, 21, 22] for deriving both bulk and edge universality of a class of generalized Wigner matrices, and used in [14] for the local spectral statistics of Erdős-Rényi graphs. Recently, Pillai and Yin adopted the Green function comparison strategy to obtain both bulk and edge universality of sample covariance matrices in the null case in [30]. Instead of replacing entries one by one in the Lindeberg swapping process in [20, 21, 22, 14], the authors in [30] use a strategy to replace once a column of the sample covariance matrices in the swapping process. Such an idea will also be pursued in our non-null case.

•: *Local eigenvalue density problem*

In order to use the Lindeberg swapping strategy on the functionals of Green function, some estimations on the entries of the Green function and the Stieltjes transform are necessary as the main technical input. Precisely, the strong law of local eigenvalue density needs to be proved at first as mentioned above. The local eigenvalue density problem was raised by Erdős, Schlein and Yau in [15] for Wigner matrices, in which the authors showed that the semicircle law holds in bulk even on microscopic scale of $N^{-3/4} \log N$ when the distributions of the entries of a Wigner matrix satisfy some regular properties. In terms of the Stieltjes transform, this result can be described as that the Stieltjes transform of the ESD of Wigner matrix concentrates on that of the semicircle law for any $z = E + i\eta$ when E is in the bulk of the semicircle law and $\eta \geq N^{-3/4} \log N$. The assumption on the distributions of the matrix entries and z (especially the lower bound of η) were improved in a series of subsequent works [16, 17, 22]. Especially, in [22], the local semicircle law was shown to be valid for $\eta \geq N^{-1}(\log N)^{O(\log \log N)}$ and E is allowed to locate in an interval including the whole support of the semicircle law therein. More specifically, in [22], the difference between the the Stieltjes transform of ESD and that of the semicircle law can be bounded by $(N\eta)^{-1}(\log N)^{O(\log \log N)}$ in magnitude with high probability. Such a result is usually referred to as the strong local semicircle law for generalized Wigner matrices. Analogously, the local MP law for the sample covariance matrices in the null case were proved in [35, 39, 19, 30] in varying degrees. Especially, in [30], the authors derived a strong local MP law. Very recently, Erdős and Farrell studied the local eigenvalue density of generalized MANOVA matrices in the bulk case in [12]. As a by-product, the authors in [12] also provided a MP type law for the local eigenvalue density of matrix $T^{1/2}XX^*T^{1/2}$ in the bulk case, where T is specified to be the inverse of another sample covariance matrix which is independent of XX^* . Obviously, the matrix $T^{1/2}XX^*T^{1/2}$ in [12] can also be regarded as a sample covariance matrix with the special random population T . In this sense, [12] shed light on establishing the local MP type law for $\mathcal{W}_N$ under our assumption.

• *Proof route and novelties of our paper*

Roughly speaking, we will also adopt the Green function strategy to prove our main result Theorem 1.3. However, since we only care about the largest eigenvalue, we will restrict the discussions on the rightmost edge of the ESD. In other words, our main task is to provide the following two:

1': A strong local MP-type law around λ_r .

2': A Green function comparison theorem on the rightmost edge of the ESD.

However, the generality of Σ in our setting produces a lot of obstacles in pursuing such a two-steps strategy.

At first, in the null case, the limiting spectral distribution is well known as Marčenko-Pastur law (MP law) which has a closed form formula. As a consequence, the properties of Stieltjes transform of MP law can be easily obtained. Actually, these basic properties are crucial inputs for establishing the edge universality in the null case. One can refer to Lemma 6.5 of [30] for instance. However, in the non-null case, to get the corresponding properties around λ_r is not a trivial thing. Actually, analysis towards the behaviors of ρ_0 and $m_0(z)$ will be our first main task. We will show that $\rho_0(x)$ admits a square root behavior in an interval $[\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, \lambda_r]$ for some small positive constant $\tilde{c}$. Such a square root behavior is guaranteed by (iii) of Condition 1.1 and will be the basic input to establish the properties of $m_0(z)$ in Lemma 2.3.

After that, we can start to establish 1' and 2'. It will be found that the roadmap of the proof in the null case in [30] is also applicable even under our general setting.

In the first step 1', we will follow the bootstrap strategy developed in [20, 22, 13, 30] to establish the strong MP-type law around λ_r . The word “bootstrap” means that one can provide a weak law of local eigenvalue density at first (in our case see Theorem 3.3), then the weak law can help to obtain the desired strong law (see Theorem 3.2) through a bootstrap process. One main technical tool to derive the strong law from the weaker one is an abstract decoupling lemma from [30] (see Lemma 7.3 therein) which can help to bound the summation of a class of weakly dependent random variables. Such a decoupling lemma is similar to Theorem 5.6 of [13] and Lemma 4.1 of [22] but is more general and applicable for our model. However, most parts of the proof require more general treatments. In the proof of 1', one main difficulty is that the self-consistent equations for the Stieltjes transforms (m_N and m_0) are more complicated than the null case. Such a complexity makes the proof of the strong local MP type law much more cumbersome. For example, in [30], once the closeness of the self-consistent equations of m_N and m_0 is obtained, the difference between m_N and m_0 themselves can be characterized easily with the aid of the closed form of m_0 . However, in the non-null case, this step is much more indirect. To overcome this difficulty, we will rely on a discussion on the stability of the self-consistent equation of the Stieltjes transform for $T^{1/2}XX^*T^{1/2}$ in [12]. Though the argument in [12] was only provided for the bulk case, we find it can be generalized to the edge case under our assumptions on $\mathcal{W}_N$.

In the proof of $\mathcal{Z}'$, we will see that a main step for the Green function comparison strategy is to bound the entries of the matrix $\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathcal{W} - z)^{-1}\Sigma^{1/2}$ when $z = E + i\eta$ with $|E - \lambda_r| \leq N^{-2/3+\varepsilon}$ and $\eta = N^{-2/3-\varepsilon}$ for some small positive constant ε . When Σ is diagonal, obviously we can bound the entries of the Green function $(\mathcal{W} - z)^{-1}$ instead. To this end, by using spectral decomposition and the strong local MP type law, we will see that it suffices to provide the so called delocalization property for the unit eigenvectors corresponding to the eigenvalues around λ_r . The delocalization property for eigenvectors of random matrices was also raised in [15] and improved in the series works [16, 17, 22] for Wigner matrices and extended to sample covariance matrices in [35, 39, 19, 30], which asserts that the coefficients of the unit eigenvectors are bounded by $N^{-1/2}(\log N)^{O(\log \log N)}$ uniformly with high probability. Hence, when Σ is diagonal, we will provide a delocalization property for the unit eigenvectors of $\mathcal{W}_N$ in the rightmost edge case. Then with the aid of the delocalization property we can bound the entries of the Green function of $\mathcal{W}$ in magnitude. However, for more general Σ , the issue becomes much more complicated. In general case, we turn to derive a rough bound on the imaginary parts of the diagonal elements of the matrix $\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathcal{W} - z)^{-1}\Sigma^{1/2}$ when $z = E + i\eta$ with $|E - \lambda_r| \leq N^{-2/3+\varepsilon}$ and $\eta = N^{-2/3-\varepsilon}$. It will be seen that such a rough bound still allows us to establish the Green function comparison theorem only with the assumption of 4 matching moments. Our main idea is to provide a rough bound for the diagonal entries of $\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathcal{W} - z_0)^{-1}\Sigma^{1/2}$ with $z_0 = E + i\eta_0$, where $\eta_0 = N^{-2/3+\varepsilon} \gg \eta$. Then by this rough bound we can obtain a rough bound on $(\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{u}_i\mathbf{u}_i^*\Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}, k = 1, \dots, M$, where $\mathbf{u}_i$ is the unit eigenvector of $\mathcal{W}$ corresponding to λ_i which is around λ_r . Then the bounds for $(\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{u}_i\mathbf{u}_i^*\Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}$ can turn to help us to provide a rough bound on the imaginary parts of the diagonal elements of the matrix $\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathcal{W} - z)^{-1}\Sigma^{1/2}$.

Throughout the paper, we will use the notation $O(\cdot)$ and $o(\cdot)$ in the conventional sense. And we will use C, C_0, C_1, C_2, C_3 to denote some positive constants whose values may be different from line to line. We say

$$x \sim y$$

if there exist some positive constants C_1 and C_2 such that

$$C_1|y| \leq |x| \leq C_2|y|.$$

We say two functions $f(z), g(z) : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ have the relation

$$f(z) \sim g(z)$$

if there exist some positive constants C_1 and C_2 independent of z such that

$$C_1|g(z)| \leq |f(z)| \leq C_2|g(z)|.$$

Define the parameter

$$\varphi := \varphi_N = (\log N)^{\log \log N}$$

which will be used throughout the paper. We say an event $\mathbb{S}$ holds with ζ -high probability if there is some positive constant C such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}) \geq 1 - N^C \exp(-\varphi^\zeta)$$

when N is large enough. Moreover, we will use $\text{Spec}(A)$ to denote spectrum of a matrix A . And we will denote the operator norm and Hilbert-Schmidt norm of a matrix A by $\|A\|_{op}$ and $\|A\|_{HS}$ respectively.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we will study the properties of $m_0(z)$ and ρ_0 which will be crucial for our further analysis. In Section 3, we will prove that $m_N(z)$ is close to $m_0(z)$ when $\Re z$ is around λ_r , i.e. the strong local MP type law holds around λ_r . In Section 4, we will use the strong local MP-type law and a Green function comparison approach to prove Theorem 1.3 and 1.5.

2. PROPERTIES OF ρ_0 AND $m_0(z)$

In this section, we will prove some crucial properties of ρ_0 and $m_0(z)$. At first, note that by the definitions of $\mathbf{c}$, λ_r and (iii) of Condition 1.1, it is easy to see

$$\mathbf{c}, \lambda_r \sim 1.$$

Below we will provide some crude lower and upper bounds on $\lambda_1(\mathcal{W})$. Note that we have the following elementary inequality

$$\lambda_M(\Sigma)\lambda_1(XX^*) \leq \lambda_1(\mathcal{W}) \leq \lambda_1(\Sigma)\lambda_1(XX^*).$$

Now by the rigidity of the locations of the eigenvalues of XX^* provided in Theorem 3.3 of [30] and Condition 1.1 we know for any fixed positive constant ζ there exists

$$\lambda_M(\Sigma)(1 + \sqrt{d})^2/5 \leq \lambda_1(\mathcal{W}) \leq 5\lambda_1(\Sigma)(1 + \sqrt{d})^2 \quad (2.1)$$

with ζ -high probability. Now we set

$$C_l = \lambda_M(\Sigma)(1 + \sqrt{d})^2/C_0, \quad C_r = C_0\lambda_1(\Sigma)(1 + \sqrt{d})^2.$$

with sufficiently large C_0 such that $\lambda_r \in [2C_l, C_r/2]$. Then by (2.1), we can choose C_0 sufficiently large such that

$$C_l \leq \lambda_1(\mathcal{W}) \leq C_r \quad (2.2)$$

with ζ -high probability. In the sequel, we will always write

$$z := E + i\eta,$$

and define the parameter

$$\kappa := \kappa(z) = |E - \lambda_r|.$$

Moreover, for $\zeta \geq 0$, we define two sets,

$$S(\zeta) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : C_l \leq E \leq C_r, \varphi^\zeta N^{-1} \leq \eta \leq 1\},$$

and

$$S_r(\tilde{c}, \zeta) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \lambda_r - \tilde{c} \leq E \leq C_r, \varphi^\zeta N^{-1} \leq \eta \leq 1\},$$

where $\tilde{c}$ is a sufficiently small positive constant whose value will be specified later. We will prove the following two lemmas. The first one claims the square root behavior of $\rho_0(x)$ on interval $[\lambda_r - 2\tilde{c}, \lambda_r]$ with some small positive constant $\tilde{c}$.

Lemma 2.1. *Under Condition 1.1, there exists some sufficiently small constant $\tilde{c} > 0$ independent of N such that*

$$\rho_0(x) \sim \sqrt{\lambda_r - x}, \quad \text{for all } x \in [\lambda_r - 2\tilde{c}, \lambda_r]. \quad (2.3)$$

Remark 2.2. *Note that in [27] and [32] the square root behavior of $\rho_0(x)$ near the boundary of its support has been discussed. However, the results in [27] and [32] does not imply (2.3) since here $m_0(z)$ and $\rho_0(x)$ are N -dependent. For general Σ , it is possible for the square root behavior only holds in an interval (with λ_r being its right end) with length of $o(1)$. For example, in the 1 spike case $\Sigma = (100, 1 \dots, 1)$, (2.3) does not hold actually.*

The second one collects some crucial properties of $m_0(z)$.

Lemma 2.3. *Under Condition 1.1, for some sufficiently small positive constant $\tilde{c}$ satisfying (2.3), the following four statements hold.*

(i): *For $z \in S(0)$, we have*

$$|m_0(z)| \sim 1,$$

(ii): *For $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 0)$, we have*

$$\Im m_0(z) \sim \begin{cases} \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{\kappa + \eta}}, & \text{if } E \geq \lambda_r + \eta \\ \sqrt{\kappa + \eta}, & \text{if } E \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, \lambda_r + \eta) \end{cases}$$

(iii): *For $z \in S(0)$, we have*

$$\frac{\Im m_0(z)}{N\eta} \geq C \frac{1}{N}, \quad \partial_\eta \frac{\Im m_0(z)}{\eta} \leq 0.$$

for some positive constant C .

(iv): *For $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 0)$, we have*

$$|1 + tm_0(z)| \geq \hat{c}(1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma)m_0(\lambda_r)) \geq c_0, \quad \forall t \in [\lambda_M(\Sigma), \lambda_1(\Sigma)]$$

for some small positive constants $\hat{c}, c_0$. Moreover, there exists a sufficiently small constant $\hat{\eta} := \hat{\eta}(c_0)$, when $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 0)$ with $\eta \leq \hat{\eta}$, we also have

$$1 + t\Re m_0(z) \geq \hat{c}(1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma)m_0(\lambda_r)) \geq c_0, \quad \forall t \in [\lambda_M(\Sigma), \lambda_1(\Sigma)]. \quad (2.4)$$

Remark 2.4. *Note the second inequality in (iii) of Lemma 2.3 implies that $\Im m_0(z)/\eta$ is decreasing in η .*

At first we come to prove Lemma 2.1, the proof of Lemma 2.3 will heavily rely on Lemma 2.1.

Proof of Lemma 2.1. For ease of presentation, we denote

$$m_1(z) = \Re m_0(z), \quad m_2(z) = \Im m_0(z).$$

Now let

$$m_0(x) := \lim_{z \in \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow x} m_0(z), \quad m_1(x) = \Re m_0(x), \quad m_2(x) = \Im m_0(x).$$

By Theorem 1.1 of [32], we know $m_0(x)$ exists for all $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Moreover, $m_0(x)$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. By definition and the inverse formula of Stieltjes transform we have

$$\rho_0(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} m_2(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\},$$

thus it suffices to prove the square root behavior of $m_2(x)$ when x is to the left of λ_r . Note that by the fact $m_2(\lambda_r) = 0$ we have

$$m_2(x) = \left(- \int_x^{\lambda_r} m_2 m_2'(t) dt \right)^{1/2}.$$

Thus it suffices to show for some sufficiently small constant $\tilde{c} > 0$ there exists some positive constants $C > C'$ independent of t such that

$$-C \leq m_2 m_2'(t) \leq -C', \quad \text{for all } t \in [\lambda_r - 2\tilde{c}, \lambda_r]. \quad (2.5)$$

To verify (2.5), we start from (1.11), which can be rewritten as

$$z = -m_0^{-1}(z) + d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t}{tm_0(z) + 1} dH_N(t). \quad (2.6)$$

Note that (2.6) also holds for $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. When $\Re z \geq c_2$ for any fixed positive number c_2 , it is easy to see from (2.6) that

$$m_0(z) \sim 1, \quad c_2 \leq \Re z \leq C_r, \quad (2.7)$$

which also implies

$$\rho_0(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} m_2(x) \leq O(1), \quad c_2 \leq x \leq \lambda_r.$$

Set $z = x$ in (2.6) and write down the real and imaginary parts of both two sides we can get

$$\begin{aligned} x &= -\frac{m_1}{m_1^2 + m_2^2} + d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t(1 + tm_1)dH_N(t)}{(1 + tm_1)^2 + t^2 m_2^2} \\ 0 &= m_2 \left(\frac{1}{m_1^2 + m_2^2} - d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^2 dH_N(t)}{(1 + tm_1)^2 + t^2 m_2^2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

When $m_2(x) \neq 0$, i.e. $m_2(x) > 0$, (2.8) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} x &= d_N^{-1} \int \frac{tdH_N(t)}{(1 + tm_1)^2 + t^2 m_2^2} \\ 0 &= \frac{1}{m_1^2 + m_2^2} - d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^2 dH_N(t)}{(1 + tm_1)^2 + t^2 m_2^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

For simplicity, above we have omitted the variable x from the notations $m_1(x)$ and $m_2(x)$. We remind here by continuity and (2.7), (2.9) still holds when $\lambda \geq c_2$ is a boundary of the support of $m_2(x)$. Moreover, when λ is a boundary of the support of $m_2(x)$ and $\lambda \geq c_2$ with any fixed positive number c_2 , (2.9) can be simplified to be

$$0 = \frac{1}{m_1^2(\lambda)} - d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^2 dH_N(t)}{(1 + tm_1(\lambda))^2} \quad (2.10)$$

since $m_2(\lambda) = 0$ in this case. Our analysis below will rely on (2.9), thus at first we need to guarantee the validity of the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *Under Condition 1.1, there exists some positive constant $\tilde{c}$ such that*

$$m_2(x) = \pi\rho_0(x) > 0$$

in $[\lambda_r - 3\tilde{c}, \lambda_r)$.

At first, we proceed to prove Lemma 2.1 assuming the validity of Lemma 2.5 and prove Lemma 2.5 after that. Using (2.8) and Lemma 2.5 we have (2.9). Now taking derivatives with respect to x implicitly on both sides of two equations in (2.9), we can get

$$m_2 m_2' = \frac{m_1(A_2 + m_1 A_3) - m_2^2 A_3}{(A_2 + m_1 A_3)^2 + m_2^2 A_3^2}, \quad (2.11)$$

where

$$A_j = 2d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^j dH_N(t)}{((1 + tm_1)^2 + t^2 m_2^2)^2}, \quad j = 2, 3.$$

Note that obviously $A_j > 0, j = 2, 3$. Moreover, if

$$\min_i (1 + \lambda_i(\Sigma)m_1(x)) > c', \quad \text{for all } x \in [\lambda_r - 2\tilde{c}, \lambda_r) \quad (2.12)$$

for some positive constant c' , we also have in $[\lambda_r - 2\tilde{c}, \lambda_r)$,

$$0 \leq m_2^2 A_3, m_2^2 A_3^2 \leq C_1 \quad (2.13)$$

and

$$C_2 \leq A_2 + m_1 A_3 \leq C_2' \quad (2.14)$$

for some positive constants C_1 and $C_2 < C_2'$. If we can take a step further to show

$$-2c_1 \leq m_1(x) \leq -c_1 \quad (2.15)$$

for some positive constant c_1 , then (2.5) immediately follows from (2.11), (2.13), (2.14) and (2.15). Therefore, it remains to show there exists some small positive constant $\tilde{c}$ such that (2.12) and (2.15) holds for all $x \in [\lambda_r - 2\tilde{c}, \lambda_r)$.

Now note that

$$m_1(\lambda_r) = m_0(\lambda_r), \quad m_2(\lambda_r) = 0.$$

At first, by the fact that $m_1(\lambda_r) = -\mathbf{c}$ and (1.3) we see $m_1(\lambda_r) < 0$. Setting $z = \lambda_r$ in (2.6) we can easily see that

$$-\frac{7}{4}c_1 \leq m_1(\lambda_r) \leq -\frac{5}{4}c_1 \quad (2.16)$$

for some positive constant c_1 . And by (iii) of Condition 1.1 and the fact that $m_1(\lambda_r) = -\mathbf{c}$ we also have

$$\min_i (1 + \lambda_i(\Sigma)m_1(\lambda_r)) = 1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma)m_1(\lambda_r) > 2c' \quad (2.17)$$

for some sufficiently small positive constant c' . Now we start from (2.16) and (2.17) to prove (2.12) and (2.15) by continuity. To show (2.12) and (2.15) hold for all $x \in [\lambda_r - 2\tilde{c}, \lambda_r]$ with some sufficiently small positive constant $\tilde{c}$, we need to control

the $|m'(x)|$. Differentiating implicitly the first equation in (2.9) with respect to x again and use (2.11), we can get

$$\begin{aligned} |m'_1(x)| &= \left| -\frac{1 + A_3 \frac{m_1(A_2 + m_1 A_3) - m_2^2 A_3}{(A_2 + A_3 m_1)^2 + A_3^2 m_2^2}}{A_2 + m_1 A_3} \right| \\ &\leq C \min_i |1 + \lambda_i(\Sigma) m_1(x)|^{-3} \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

which can be easily checked by the definition of $A_j, j = 2, 3$. Now we set

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_0 &:= \lambda_0(\tilde{c}) \\ &= \inf\{x \in [\lambda_r - 3\tilde{c}, \lambda_r) : \frac{1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma) m_1(t)}{1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma) m_1(\lambda_r)} \geq 1/2 \text{ and } m_1(t) \in [-2c_1, -c_1], \forall x \leq t < \lambda_r\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

Now we claim when $\tilde{c}$ is sufficiently small, there exists

$$\lambda_r - \lambda_0 \geq 2\tilde{c}. \quad (2.20)$$

Otherwise, we can assume $\lambda_r - \lambda_0 \leq 2\tilde{c}$ for arbitrary small constant $\tilde{c}$ thus $\lambda_0 > \lambda_r - 3\tilde{c}$. Then by continuity we have

$$1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma) m_1(\lambda_0) = 1/2(1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma) m_1(\lambda_r)), \quad \text{or} \quad m_1(\lambda_0) = -2c_1 \text{ or } -c_1$$

If $1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma) m_1(\lambda_0) = 1/2(1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma) m_1(\lambda_r))$, by using (2.18) we have

$$c' \leq |(1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma) m_1(\lambda_0)) - (1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma) m_1(\lambda_r))| \leq C |1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma) m_1(\lambda_\xi)|^{-3} \tilde{c}$$

for some $\lambda_\xi \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_r]$. However, by the definition of λ_0 , we get a contradiction if $\tilde{c}$ is selected to be sufficiently small. If $m_1(\lambda_0) = -2c_1$ or $-c_1$, we see

$$\frac{1}{4} c_1 \leq |m_1(\lambda_r) - m_1(\lambda_0)| \leq C |1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma) m_1(\lambda_\xi)|^{-3} \tilde{c}.$$

Then by definition of λ_0 , we also get a contradiction when $\tilde{c}$ is small enough. Thus we conclude the proof. $\square$

Now we come to prove Lemma 2.5.

Proof of Lemma 2.5. We define the largest endpoint of the support of ρ_0 smaller than λ_r by λ_{r-} . It suffices to show that there exists a sufficiently small constant $\tilde{c}$ such that

$$\lambda_r - \lambda_{r-} \geq 4\tilde{c}. \quad (2.21)$$

Note that by (2.10), we know when λ is an endpoint of the support of ρ_0 and $\lambda \geq c_2$ with any fixed positive number c_2 , there must be

$$\int \frac{t^2 m_1^2(\lambda)}{(1 + t m_1(\lambda))^2} dH_N(t) = d_N, \quad m_2(\lambda) = 0. \quad (2.22)$$

In the sequel we assume $\lambda_{r-} \geq c_2$ for some fixed positive number c_2 , otherwise (2.21) holds naturally. We already know that $m_1(\lambda_r)$ is the unique solution of the equation

$$\int \frac{t^2 x^2}{(1 + tx)^2} dH_N(t) = d_N$$

in $(-1/\lambda_1(\Sigma), 0)$. Thus we have

$$m_1(\lambda_{r-}) \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (-1/\lambda_1(\Sigma), 0). \quad (2.23)$$

By (iii) of Condition 1.1, we have

$$-1/\lambda_1(\Sigma) - c'' \leq m_1(\lambda_r) \leq -\frac{5}{4}c_1 \leq -c'' \quad (2.24)$$

for some small positive constant c'' . Here the upper bound in (2.24) follows from (2.16). Hence, (2.23) and (2.24) imply

$$|m_1(\lambda_r) - m_1(\lambda_{r-})| \geq c''. \quad (2.25)$$

Now use (2.6) we have

$$\lambda_r - \lambda_{r-} = \frac{|(m_1(\lambda_r) - m_1(\lambda_{r-}))|}{|m_1(\lambda_r)m_1(\lambda_{r-})|} \left| 1 - d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^2 m_1(\lambda_r)m_1(\lambda_{r-})dH_N(t)}{(1 + tm_1(\lambda_r))(1 + tm_1(\lambda_{r-}))} \right| \quad (2.26)$$

Note that from (2.7) we have

$$m_1(\lambda_{r-}), m_1(\lambda_r) \sim 1.$$

Then by (2.25) it suffices show that there exists some positive constant c''' such that

$$\left| 1 - d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^2 m_1(\lambda_r)m_1(\lambda_{r-})dH_N(t)}{(1 + tm_1(\lambda_r))(1 + tm_1(\lambda_{r-}))} \right| \geq c'''. \quad (2.27)$$

Now we come to verify (2.27). Note that by (2.22) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| 1 - d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^2 m_1(\lambda_r)m_1(\lambda_{r-})dH_N(t)}{(1 + tm_1(\lambda_r))(1 + tm_1(\lambda_{r-}))} \right| \\ &= d_N^{-1} \left| \int \frac{t^2 m_1^2(\lambda_{r-})dH_N(t)}{(1 + tm_1(\lambda_{r-}))^2} - \int \frac{t^2 m_1(\lambda_r)m_1(\lambda_{r-})dH_N(t)}{(1 + tm_1(\lambda_r))(1 + tm_1(\lambda_{r-}))} \right| \\ &= d_N^{-1} \left| \frac{m_1(\lambda_{r-}) - m_1(\lambda_r)}{m_1(\lambda_{r-})} \int \frac{t^2 m_1^2(\lambda_{r-})dH_N(t)}{(1 + tm_1(\lambda_{r-}))^2(1 + tm_1(\lambda_r))} \right| \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by assumption we have

$$1 + tm_1(\lambda_r) \geq c', \quad \forall t \in \text{Spec}(\Sigma).$$

Combining these facts with (2.25) and (2.22) for $m_1(\lambda_{r-})$, we obtain (2.27) with some sufficiently small $c''' > 0$. Inserting (2.25) and (2.27) into (2.26) we obtain that (2.21) holds with some positive constant $\tilde{c} := \tilde{c}(c'', c''')$, which implies Lemma 2.5. $\square$

With the aid of Lemma 2.1, now we can start to prove Lemma 2.3.

Proof of Lemma 2.3. Note that by definition,

$$\frac{\Im m_0(z)}{\eta} = \int \frac{1}{(x - E)^2 + \eta^2} dF_0(x),$$

thus the second inequality of (iii) follows directly. It suffices to verify (i), (ii), (iv) and the first inequality of (iii) in the sequel. At first, we come to show (i). Note that when $z \in S(0)$, there is

$$C_l \leq E \leq C_r.$$

Then it is easy to obtain (i) by (2.6).

Now we come to verify (ii). The proof of (ii) relies on Lemma 2.1. By definition we have

$$m_0(z) = \int \frac{1}{x-z} dF_0(x).$$

At first we deal with the case of

$$E \geq \lambda_r + \eta.$$

We do it as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \Im m_0(z) &= \int_0^{\lambda_r} \frac{\eta}{(x-E)^2 + \eta^2} dF_0(x) \\ &= \int_{C_l/2}^{\lambda_r} \frac{\eta}{(x-E)^2 + \eta^2} \rho_0(x) dx + O(\eta) \\ &= \int_{C_l/2}^{\lambda_r - \tilde{c}} \frac{\eta}{(x-E)^2 + \eta^2} \rho_0(x) dx + \int_{\lambda_r - \tilde{c}}^{\lambda_r} \frac{\eta}{(x-E)^2 + \eta^2} \rho_0(x) dx + O(\eta) \\ &\sim \eta + \int_{\lambda_r - \tilde{c}}^{\lambda_r} \frac{\eta}{(\lambda_r - x)^2 + (\kappa + \eta)^2} \sqrt{\lambda_r - x} dx \\ &= \eta + \int_0^{\tilde{c}} \frac{\eta}{t^2 + (\kappa + \eta)^2} \sqrt{t} dt \end{aligned}$$

Now if $\tilde{c} \geq \kappa + \eta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\tilde{c}} \frac{\eta}{t^2 + (\kappa + \eta)^2} \sqrt{t} dt &= \int_0^{\kappa + \eta} \frac{\eta}{t^2 + (\kappa + \eta)^2} \sqrt{t} dt + \int_{\kappa + \eta}^{\tilde{c}} \frac{\eta}{t^2 + (\kappa + \eta)^2} \sqrt{t} dt \\ &\sim \int_0^{\kappa + \eta} \frac{\eta}{(\kappa + \eta)^2} \sqrt{t} dt + \int_{\kappa + \eta}^{\tilde{c}} \frac{\eta}{t^2} \sqrt{t} dt \\ &\sim \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{\kappa + \eta}}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\tilde{c} < \kappa + \eta$, then we have

$$\int_0^{\tilde{c}} \frac{\eta}{t^2 + (\kappa + \eta)^2} \sqrt{t} dt \sim \int_0^{\kappa + \eta} \frac{\eta}{(\kappa + \eta)^2} \sqrt{t} dt \sim \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{\kappa + \eta}}.$$

Now we come to deal with the case of

$$E \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, \lambda_r + \eta).$$

Note that our discussion for the case of $E \geq \lambda_r + \eta$ can be extended to the case of $E \geq \lambda_r$. Actually, in the region $E \in [\lambda_r, \lambda_r + \eta]$, $\kappa \leq \eta$, thus one has

$$\frac{\eta}{\sqrt{\kappa + \eta}} \sim \sqrt{\kappa + \eta}.$$

Therefore, it suffices to handle the case of $E \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, \lambda_r]$. Note

$$\begin{aligned}
\Im m_0(z) &= \int_0^{\lambda_r} \frac{\eta}{(x-E)^2 + \eta^2} dF_0(x) \\
&= \int_{C_l/2}^{\lambda_r} \frac{\eta}{(x-E)^2 + \eta^2} \rho_0(x) dx + O(\eta) \\
&= \int_{C_l/2}^{\lambda_r - 2\tilde{c}} \frac{\eta}{(x-E)^2 + \eta^2} \rho_0(x) dx + \int_{\lambda_r - 2\tilde{c}}^{\lambda_r} \frac{\eta}{(x-E)^2 + \eta^2} \rho_0(x) dx + O(\eta) \\
&\sim \eta + \int_{\lambda_r - 2\tilde{c}}^{\lambda_r} \frac{\eta}{(x-E)^2 + \eta^2} (\sqrt{|x-E|} + \sqrt{\kappa}) dx
\end{aligned}$$

By splitting the integral region $[\lambda_r - 2\tilde{c}, \lambda_r]$ into two parts by $|x-E| \geq \kappa$ or $|x-E| < \kappa$, it is easy to see

$$\Im m_0(z) = O(\sqrt{\kappa + \eta}).$$

Thus we proved (ii).

Now we start to show the first inequality of (iii) whose proof will also relies on Lemma 2.1. Note that by discussions above we have

$$\Im m_0(z) \geq \int_{C_l/2}^{\lambda_r} \frac{\eta}{(x-E)^2 + \eta^2} \rho_0(x) dx \geq \int_{\lambda_r - 2\tilde{c}}^{\lambda_r} \frac{\eta}{(x-E)^2 + \eta^2} \rho_0(x) dx.$$

Then it is obvious that

$$\Im m_0(z) \geq C\eta, \quad (2.28)$$

since

$$\rho_0(x) \sim \sqrt{\lambda_r - x} \sim 1, \quad x \in [\lambda_r - 2\tilde{c}, \lambda_r - \tilde{c}].$$

At the end, we come to prove (iv). At first, we claim that when $\tilde{c}$ is small enough, there exists

$$\inf_{t \in [\lambda_M(\Sigma), \lambda_1(\Sigma)]} |1 + tm_0(x)| \geq 1/2(1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma)m_0(\lambda_r)), \quad \forall x \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, C_r]. \quad (2.29)$$

To see (2.29), we split the interval into $(\lambda_r, C_r]$ and $[\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, \lambda_r]$. For the first case, it is not difficult to see $m_0(x) = m_1(x)$ is negative and increasing, thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{t \in [\lambda_M(\Sigma), \lambda_1(\Sigma)]} |1 + tm_0(x)| &= \inf_{t \in [\lambda_M(\Sigma), \lambda_1(\Sigma)]} (1 + tm_0(x)) \\
&= 1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma)m_0(x) \geq 1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma)m_0(\lambda_r) \quad (2.30)
\end{aligned}$$

when $x \geq \lambda_r$. For the second case, we recall λ_0 defined in (2.19) and the inequality (2.20). Then it is obvious that

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{t \in [\lambda_M(\Sigma), \lambda_1(\Sigma)]} |1 + tm_0(x)| &\geq \inf_{t \in [\lambda_M(\Sigma), \lambda_1(\Sigma)]} (1 + tm_1(x)) \\
&= 1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma)m_1(x) \geq \frac{1}{2}(1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma)m_0(\lambda_r)) \quad (2.31)
\end{aligned}$$

when $x \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, \lambda_r]$. Thus (2.29) follows. Moreover, (2.30) and (2.31) also imply that

$$\inf_{t \in [\lambda_M(\Sigma), \lambda_1(\Sigma)]} (1 + tm_1(x)) \geq \frac{1}{2}(1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma)m_0(\lambda_r)), \quad x \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, C_r]. \quad (2.32)$$

Now we extend (2.29) and (2.32) from the real line to the full region $S_r(\tilde{c}, 0)$. At first, we use an elementary inequality which can be found in [3] (see the proof of Lemma 6.10 therein), in which the following inequality is proved,

$$|(m(z)x + 1)^{-1}| \leq \max\left(\frac{4x}{\eta}, 2\right), \quad (2.33)$$

where $m(z) := m(E + i\eta)$ can be the Stieltjes transform of arbitrary probability measure and x can be any positive number. By (2.33), we know that

$$\inf_{t \in [\lambda_M(\Sigma), \lambda_1(\Sigma)]} |1 + tm_0(z)| \geq \min\left(\frac{\eta}{4\lambda_1(\Sigma)}, \frac{1}{2}\right).$$

Therefore, it suffices to show (2.4) when η is sufficiently small. To this end, we will combine (2.32) and a bound of derivative of $m_1(z)$ with respect to η which can be obtained as follows. By definition, we have for any $\eta > 0$,

$$m_1(z) = \int \frac{x - E}{(x - E)^2 + \eta^2} dF_0(x), \quad \partial_\eta m_1(z) = -2 \int \frac{(x - E)\eta}{((x - E)^2 + \eta^2)^2} dF_0(x).$$

Now let α be a small positive constant. At first, we handle the case of $E \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, \lambda_r]$. We split the estimation of $\partial_\eta m_1(z)$ into two cases: $\kappa \leq 2\eta^{1-\alpha}$ and $\kappa \geq 2\eta^{1-\alpha}$. Note that for the first case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\eta m_1(z)| &= 2 \left| \left(\int_{C_l/2}^{E-\eta^{1-\alpha}} + \int_{E-\eta^{1-\alpha}}^{\lambda_r} \right) \frac{(x - E)\eta}{((x - E)^2 + \eta^2)^2} \rho_0(x) dx \right| + O(\eta) \\ &\leq C \left(\int_{C_l/2}^{E-\eta^{1-\alpha}} \frac{\eta}{(E - x)^3} dx + \int_{E-\eta^{1-\alpha}}^{\lambda_r} \eta^{2-\alpha} \cdot \eta^{-4} \cdot \eta^{(1-\alpha)/2} dx \right) + O(\eta) \\ &= C(\eta^{-1+2\alpha} + \eta^{-1/2-5\alpha/2}) \\ &= O(\eta^{-1+2\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

when α is chosen to be sufficiently small.

When $\kappa \geq 2\eta^{1-\alpha}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\eta m_1(z)| &= 2 \left| \left(\int_{C_l/2}^{E-\eta^{1-\alpha}} + \int_{E+\eta^{1-\alpha}}^{\lambda_r} + \int_{E-\eta^{1-\alpha}}^{E+\eta^{1-\alpha}} \right) \frac{(x - E)\eta}{((x - E)^2 + \eta^2)^2} \rho_0(x) dx \right| + O(\eta) \\ &\leq 2 \left| \int_{E-\eta^{1-\alpha}}^{E+\eta^{1-\alpha}} \frac{(x - E)\eta}{((x - E)^2 + \eta^2)^2} \rho_0(x) dx \right| + C\eta^{-1+2\alpha} \\ &= 2 \left| \int_{E-\eta^{1-\alpha}}^{E+\eta^{1-\alpha}} \frac{(x - E)\eta}{((x - E)^2 + \eta^2)^2} (\rho_0(E) + \rho'_0(\xi_{\{E, x\}})(x - E)) dx \right| + C\eta^{-1+2\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

by the mean value theorem, where $\xi_{\{E,x\}}$ is some real number between E and x . Note the analyticity of $\rho_0(x)$ in its support has been proved in [32]. Moreover, we have

$$|\rho_0(t)| \sim (\lambda_r - t)^{-1/2}, \quad t \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, \lambda_r)$$

which is implied by (2.5) and Lemma 2.1. Thus by the assumption of $\kappa \geq 2\eta^{1-\alpha}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\eta m_1(z)| &\leq 2 \int_{E-\eta^{1-\alpha}}^{E+\eta^{1-\alpha}} \frac{(x-E)^2 \eta}{((x-E)^2 + \eta^2)^2} |\rho'_0(\xi_{\{E,x\}})| dx + C\eta^{-1+2\alpha} \\ &\leq C \left(\int_{E-\eta^{1-\alpha}}^{E+\eta^{1-\alpha}} \eta^{3-2\alpha} \cdot \eta^{-4} \cdot \eta^{-1/2+\alpha/2} dx + \eta^{-1+2\alpha} \right) \\ &\leq O(\eta^{-1+2\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

when α is chosen to be sufficiently small.

The case of $E \in (\lambda_r, C_r)$ is similar and simpler, thus we omit the details. Actually, for $E \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, C_r]$, we have

$$|\partial_\eta m_1(z)| \leq O(\eta^{-1+2\alpha})$$

for all $\eta \leq \hat{\eta}$ with some sufficiently small constant $\hat{\eta}$.

Now we recall (2.29) and fix an $E \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, C_r]$. Since $m_0(E + i\eta)$ is continuous for $\eta \geq 0$, there must exist some small positive η_0 such that

$$1 + tm_1(E + i\eta_0) \geq \frac{1}{2}(1 + tm_1(E)) \geq \frac{1}{4}(1 + \lambda_1(\Sigma)m_1(\lambda_r)), \quad t \in [\lambda_M(\Sigma), \lambda_1(\Sigma)].$$

Now consider $E + i\eta \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 0)$. Note that we have mentioned above it suffices to consider the case when η is sufficiently small. Observe that we have

$$|m_1(E + i\eta) - m_1(E + i\eta_0)| = \left| \int_{\eta_0}^{\eta} \partial_t m_1(E + it) dt \right| \leq C \left| \int_{\eta_0}^{\eta} t^{-1+2\alpha} dt \right| \leq C\eta^{2\alpha}.$$

Therefore, when η is sufficiently small, we have

$$\inf_{t \in [\lambda_M(\Sigma), \lambda_1(\Sigma)]} (1 + t(\Sigma)m_1(E + i\eta)) \geq \hat{c}(1 + \lambda_i(\Sigma)m_1(\lambda_r)) \geq c_0$$

with some small positive constant $\hat{c}, c_0$. Therefore, we conclude the proof. $\square$

3. ASYMPTOTIC ANALYSIS OF $m_N(z)$

In this section, we will prove the strong local MP-type law around λ_r , see Theorem 3.2 below. To this end, we will derive a self-consistent equation for $m_N(z)$, which is quite close to that of $m_0(z)$ (see (1.11)). Then we can figure out the closeness of $m_N(z)$ and $m_0(z)$ through studying the stability of the self-consistent equation of $m_0(z)$. Such an approach is classical in the Random Matrix Theory, one can refer to [3] for instance. Actually, for our matrix model $\mathcal{W}_N$, the concentrate inequality for $m_N(z)$ around $m_0(z)$ was established in [2] for $\eta \geq O(N^{-1/2})$. We also have mentioned in Introduction that in [12] the local eigenvalue density problem was studied towards a special matrix model $T^{1/2}XX^*T^{1/2}$ in the bulk case, where T is specified to be the inverse of another sample covariance matrix independent of XX^* .

In [12], a weak local MP type law was obtained in the bulk case for $T^{1/2}XX^*T^{1/2}$. The main proof route in this section is parallel to that in [30]. However, owing to the generality of Σ , most parts require more general treatments.

To simplify some discussions in the sequel, we will truncate and renormalize $\sqrt{N}x_{ij}$ at first. Let C'_0 be some sufficiently large positive constant. We set

$$\hat{x}_{ij} = x_{ij} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\sqrt{N}x_{ij}| \leq (\log N)^{C'_0}\}}, \quad \tilde{x}_{ij} = \frac{\hat{x}_{ij} - \mathbb{E}\hat{x}_{ij}}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{x}_{ij})}}.$$

Now set $\hat{X} := (\hat{x}_{ij})_{M,N}$ and $\tilde{X} := (\tilde{x}_{ij})_{M,N}$. Correspondingly, let

$$\hat{\mathcal{W}}_N := \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{X} \hat{X}^* \Sigma^{1/2}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_N := \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{X} \tilde{X}^* \Sigma^{1/2}.$$

Moreover, by (1.4) we see

$$\mathcal{W}_N = \hat{\mathcal{W}}_N \tag{3.1}$$

with probability larger than

$$1 - O\left(N^2 \exp(-(\log N)^{\tau_0 C'_0})\right) \gg 1 - \exp(-(\log N)^2)$$

if we choose C'_0 to be sufficiently large. Moreover, note that

$$\tilde{x}_{ij} = \hat{x}_{ij} + O(\exp(-(\log N)^{C'_0})).$$

Thus by using basic perturbation theory of eigenvalues such as Weyl's inequality, we have

$$\max_i |\lambda_i(\mathcal{W}_N) - \lambda_i(\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_N)| \leq N^{O(1)} \exp(-(\log N)^{C'_0}). \tag{3.2}$$

Consequently, by (3.1) and (3.2) we can work on $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_N$ instead of $\mathcal{W}_N$. Moreover, by (1.4) it is easy to check that $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_N$ matches $\mathcal{W}_N$ to order k with any fixed k . That means, if $\mathcal{W}_N^{\mathbf{u}}$ matches $\mathcal{W}_N^{\mathbf{v}}$ to order k , we also have $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_N^{\mathbf{u}}$ matches $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_N^{\mathbf{v}}$ to order k .

For ease of presentation, we recycle the notations X and $\mathcal{W}_N$ to denote $\tilde{X}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_N$, and we also denote the truncated and renormalized variable $\tilde{x}_{ij}$ by x_{ij} in the sequel. Thus without loss of generality, we will assume

$$\max_{i,j} |\sqrt{N}x_{ij}| \leq (\log N)^{C'_0}. \tag{3.3}$$

Now we introduce some notations. We denote the Green functions of W_N and $\mathcal{W}_N$ respectively by

$$G_N(z) := (W_N - z)^{-1}, \quad \mathcal{G}_N(z) = (\mathcal{W}_N - z)^{-1},$$

where $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. For ease of presentation, when there is no confusion we will omit the subscript N or variable z from the above notations. Note that by definition we have

$$m_N(z) = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} G(z), \quad \underline{m}_N(z) = \frac{1}{M} \text{Tr} \mathcal{G}(z),$$

and

$$\text{Tr} G(z) - \text{Tr} \mathcal{G}(z) = \frac{M - N}{z}.$$

Furthermore, we use $\mathbf{x}_i$ to denote the i -th column of X , and introduce the notation $X^{(\mathbb{T})}$ to denote the $M \times (N - |\mathbb{T}|)$ minor of X obtained by deleting $\mathbf{x}_i$ from X if $i \in \mathbb{T}$.

For convenience, we will briefly write $(\{i\})$ and $(\{i, j\})$ as (i) and (ij) respectively. Correspondingly, we denote

$$W^{(\mathbb{T})} = X^{(\mathbb{T})*} \Sigma X^{(\mathbb{T})}, \quad \mathcal{W}^{(\mathbb{T})} = \Sigma^{1/2} X^{(\mathbb{T})} X^{(\mathbb{T})*} \Sigma^{1/2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} G^{(\mathbb{T})}(z) &= (W^{(\mathbb{T})} - z)^{-1}, \quad \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{T})}(z) = (\mathcal{W}^{(\mathbb{T})} - z)^{-1}. \\ m_N^{(\mathbb{T})}(z) &= \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} G^{(\mathbb{T})}(z), \quad \underline{m}_N^{(\mathbb{T})}(z) = \frac{1}{M} \text{Tr} \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{T})}(z). \end{aligned}$$

In the sequel, we will keep the names of indices of X for $X^{(\mathbb{T})}$. That means

$$X_{ij}^{(\mathbb{T})} = \mathbf{1}_{\{j \notin \mathbb{T}\}} X_{ij}.$$

Correspondingly, we will denote (i, j) -th entry of $G^{(\mathbb{T})}(z)$ by $G_{ij}^{(\mathbb{T})}(z)$ for all $i, j \notin \mathbb{T}$. Similarly, we remind here the index (i, j) is not in the conventional sense. Note that by definition, $G^{(\mathbb{T})}$ is an $(N - |\mathbb{T}|) \times (N - |\mathbb{T}|)$ matrix. However, here we use the index set $\{1, \dots, N\} \setminus \mathbb{T}$ instead of $\{1, \dots, N - |\mathbb{T}|\}$. Set

$$\mathbf{r}_i = \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{x}_i.$$

At first, we state the following Lemma which collects some basic formulas on the entries of Green functions.

Lemma 3.1. *Under the above notations, we have*

(i):

$$G_{ii}(z) = -\frac{1}{z + z \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z) \mathbf{r}_i}.$$

(ii):

$$G_{ij}(z) = z G_{ii}(z) G_{jj}^{(i)}(z) \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(ij)}(z) \mathbf{r}_j, \quad i \neq j.$$

(iii):

$$G_{ij}(z) = G_{ij}^{(k)}(z) + \frac{G_{ik}(z) G_{kj}(z)}{G_{kk}(z)}, \quad i, j \neq k.$$

Proof. One can refer to Lemma 2.3 of [30] or Lemma 3.2 of [22] for instance. Actually, if we regard $\mathbf{r}_i$ as $\mathbf{x}_i$ in [30], then G has the same structure as that in the null case in [30], so does $\mathcal{G}$. $\square$

By Lemma 3.1 we see that

$$m_N(z) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N G_{ii}(z) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{z + z \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z) \mathbf{r}_i}. \quad (3.4)$$

Now we write

$$m_N(z) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{z - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(m_N(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma + Y_i}, \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$Y_i = z\mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z)\mathbf{r}_i + \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(m_N(z)\Sigma + I)^{-1}\Sigma.$$

Observe that

$$\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(m_N(z)\Sigma + I)^{-1}\Sigma = d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t}{1 + tm_N(z)} dH_N(t).$$

Below we will use the decomposition

$$Y_i = z(T_i + U_i + V),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_i &:= T_i(z) = \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z)\mathbf{r}_i - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z)\Sigma, \\ U_i &:= U_i(z) = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z)\Sigma - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \mathcal{G}(z)\Sigma, \\ V &:= V(z) = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \mathcal{G}(z)\Sigma - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(-zm_N(z)\Sigma - zI)^{-1}\Sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Note that by definition

$$\mathcal{W} = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i^*, \quad \mathcal{G}(z) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i^* - zI \right)^{-1}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{G}(z) - (-zm_N(z)\Sigma - zI)^{-1} \\ &= -(-zm_N(z)\Sigma - zI)^{-1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i^* - (-zm_N(z)\Sigma) \right] \mathcal{G}(z). \end{aligned}$$

Now using the Sherman-Morrison formula

$$\mathbf{r}^*(\mathbf{C} + \mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}^*)^{-1} = \frac{1}{1 + \mathbf{r}^*\mathbf{C}^{-1}\mathbf{r}} \mathbf{r}^*\mathbf{C}^{-1}$$

for any invertible matrix $\mathbf{C}$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}(z) = \frac{1}{1 + \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z)\mathbf{r}_i} \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &-(-zm_N(z)\Sigma - zI)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}(z) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{z(1 + \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z)\mathbf{r}_i)} \cdot (m_N(z)\Sigma + I)^{-1} \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z). \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Taking (3.4) into account we obtain

$$-(-zm_N(z)\Sigma - zI)^{-1}(-zm_N(z))\Sigma \mathcal{G}(z)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{z(1 + \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z) \mathbf{r}_i)} \cdot \frac{1}{N} (m_N(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma \mathcal{G}(z). \quad (3.8)$$

Combining (3.7) and (3.8) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{G}(z) - (-zm_N(z) \Sigma - zI)^{-1} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{z(1 + \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z) \mathbf{r}_i)} \cdot \left[(m_N(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z) - \frac{1}{N} (m_N(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma \mathcal{G}(z) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can further decompose $V(z)$ defined in (3.6) into four parts.

$$V(z) := v_1(z) + v_2(z) + v_3(z) + v_4(z),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} v_1(z) &:= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N G_{ii} \left[\mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma (m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \mathbf{r}_i - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma \right], \\ v_2(z) &:= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N G_{ii} \left[\mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma (m_N(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma (m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \mathbf{r}_i \right], \\ v_3(z) &:= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N G_{ii} \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma \mathcal{G} \Sigma \right], \\ v_4(z) &:= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N G_{ii} \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma \mathcal{G} \Sigma - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(m_N(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma \mathcal{G} \Sigma \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we will denote

$$v_{1i} := v_{1i}(z) = \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma (m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \mathbf{r}_i - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma, \quad (3.9)$$

thus

$$v_1(z) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N G_{ii} v_{1i}.$$

In the sequel, we will also encounter the quantity

$$\begin{aligned} R_i(z) &:= \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma (m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma (m_0(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \mathbf{r}_i \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma (m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma (m_0(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that if we can show that Y_i 's are small enough, (3.5) turns out to be close to (1.11). Roughly speaking, our main task in the sequel is to bound the quantities

$$|Y_i(z)|, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

in some region we are interested in. Then we will take a step further to figure out the closeness of $m_N(z)$ and $m_0(z)$. Specifically, We will provide bounds for the following quantities

$$\Lambda_d(z) := \max_i |G_{ii}(z) - m_0(z)|, \quad \Lambda_o(z) := \max_{i \neq j} |G_{ij}(z)|, \quad \Lambda(z) := |m_N(z) - m_0(z)|$$

for all $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, C)$ with some positive constant C . Our target in this section is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2 (Strong local MP type law around λ_r). *Under Condition 1.1 and (3.3), for any $\zeta > 0$ there exists some constant C_ζ such that*
(i):

$$\bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)} \left\{ \Lambda(z) \leq \varphi^{C_\zeta} \frac{1}{N\eta} \right\} \quad (3.10)$$

holds with ζ -high probability, and

(ii):

$$\bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)} \left\{ \Lambda_o(z) + \Lambda_d(z) \leq \varphi^{C_\zeta} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\Im m_0(z)}{N\eta}} + \frac{1}{N\eta} \right) \right\} \quad (3.11)$$

holds with ζ -high probability.

Roughly speaking, in this part, we will adopt the proof route of that for Theorem 3.1 of [30]. At first, we will provide a weak bound for the strong local MP type law around the right edge. And then we use the weak bound to get the strong bound. As mentioned in Introduction, such a bootstrap strategy was developed in series works [20, 22, 13, 30]. However, since the generality of our setting on Σ , most parts of the proof need new techniques thus the details are relatively different from those of the null case in [30]. Especially, in the discussion of the stability of the self-consistent equation of $m_0(z)$, we will extend an idea from [12] to our case.

3.1. Weak local MP type law around λ_r . In this subsection, we will prove the following weak local MP type law in the region around λ_r .

Theorem 3.3. *Under Condition 1.1 and (3.3), for any $\zeta > 0$, there exists some positive constant C_ζ such that the event*

$$\bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)} \left\{ \Lambda_d(z) + \Lambda_o(z) \leq \varphi^{C_\zeta} \frac{1}{(N\eta)^{1/4}} \right\}.$$

holds with ζ -high probability.

At first, it follows from the definitions that

$$\Lambda(z) \leq \Lambda_d(z) \leq \max_i |G_{ii}(z) - m_N(z)| + \Lambda(z). \quad (3.12)$$

For $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$ and positive number K we define the event

$$\begin{aligned} & \Omega(z, K) \\ &:= \left\{ \max \left\{ \Lambda_o(z), \max_i |G_{ii}(z) - m_N(z)|, \max_i |T_i(z)|, \max_i |R_i(z)|, \max_i |v_{1i}(z)| \right\} \geq K\Psi(z) \right\} \\ & \cup \left\{ \max \left\{ \max_i |U_i(z)|, |v_2(z)|, |v_3(z)|, |v_4(z)| \right\} \geq K^2\Psi^2(z) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\Psi(z) := \sqrt{\frac{\Im m_0(z) + \Lambda(z)}{N\eta}}.$$

Moreover, we set the events

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi(z) &:= \{\Lambda_o(z) + \Lambda_d(z) > (\log N)^{-1}\}, \\ \Gamma(z, K) &:= \Omega(z, K)^c \cup \Xi(z).\end{aligned}\tag{3.13}$$

In the sequel, we will frequently use the following large deviation estimates whose proof can be found in [21].

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j, i \neq j$ be two columns of the matrix X satisfying (ii) of Condition 1.1. Then for any $M \times 1$ vector $\mathbf{b}$ and $M \times M$ matrix $\mathbf{C}$ independent of $\mathbf{x}_i$ and $\mathbf{x}_j$, the following three inequalities hold with ζ -high probability*

(i):

$$|\mathbf{x}_i^* \mathbf{C} \mathbf{x}_i - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \mathbf{C}| \leq \frac{\varphi^{\tau\zeta}}{N} \|\mathbf{C}\|_{HS}.$$

(ii):

$$|\mathbf{x}_i^* \mathbf{C} \mathbf{x}_j| \leq \frac{\varphi^{\tau\zeta}}{N} \|\mathbf{C}\|_{HS}.$$

(iii):

$$|\mathbf{b}^* \mathbf{x}_i| \leq \frac{\varphi^{\tau\zeta}}{\sqrt{N}} \|\mathbf{b}\|.$$

Here $\tau := \tau(\tau_0) > 1$ is some positive constant.

Proof. See Appendix B of [21] for instance. $\square$

To prove Theorem 3.3, we will provide the desired bound for the case of $\eta \sim 1$ at first. Then we extend it to the full region $S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$. To fulfill the first step, by (3.12) it suffices to prove the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3.5. *Under Condition 1.1 and (3.3), for any $\zeta > 0$, there exists a constant C_ζ such that the event*

$$\bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta), \eta \sim 1} \Omega(z, \varphi^{C_\zeta})^c$$

holds with ζ -high probability.

Lemma 3.6. *Under Condition 1.1 and (3.3), for any $\zeta > 0$ there exists a constant C_ζ such that*

$$\bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta), \eta \sim 1} \{\Lambda(z) \leq \varphi^{C_\zeta} \frac{1}{(N\eta)^{1/2}}\}$$

holds with ζ -high probability.

At first, we need the following bounds on the elements of Green functions to verify Lemma 3.5 and 3.6.

Lemma 3.7. *When $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$ with $\eta \sim 1$, for any $\mathbb{T} \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$ with $|\mathbb{T}| = O(1)$ we have*

$$G_{ii}^{(\mathbb{T})}, m_N^{(\mathbb{T})} \sim 1, \quad \Lambda_o^{(\mathbb{T})} \leq O(1), \quad \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} |\mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{T})}| \leq O(1) \quad (3.14)$$

with ζ -high probability.

Proof. By spectral decomposition, we have

$$G_{ii}^{(\mathbb{T})}(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{N-|\mathbb{T}|} \frac{1}{\lambda_k(W^{(\mathbb{T})}) - z} |\mathbf{u}_{ki}(W^{(\mathbb{T})})|^2.$$

Here $\lambda_k(W^{(\mathbb{T})})$ is the k -th largest eigenvalue of $W^{(\mathbb{T})}$ by the notation in (1.2) and

$$\mathbf{u}_k(W^{(\mathbb{T})}) := (\mathbf{u}_{k1}(W^{(\mathbb{T})}), \dots, \mathbf{u}_{k,N-|\mathbb{T}|}(W^{(\mathbb{T})}))$$

is its corresponding unit eigenvector. Now similar to (2.2), we see $\lambda_1(W^{(\mathbb{T})})$ is bounded with ζ high probability, thus when $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$ with $\eta \sim 1$ we have

$$|G_{ii}^{(\mathbb{T})}(z)| \geq \Im G_{ii}^{(\mathbb{T})}(z) = \frac{\eta}{(\lambda_1(W^{(\mathbb{T})}) - E)^2 + \eta^2} \sum |\mathbf{u}_{ki}(W^{(\mathbb{T})})|^2 \geq C^{-1}$$

for some positive constant C with ζ -high probability. It is similar to show that $m_N^{(\mathbb{T})} \sim 1$ with ζ -high probability. Moreover, we also have the definite upper bound

$$|G_{ij}^{(\mathbb{T})}(z)| = \left| \sum_{k=1}^{N-|\mathbb{T}|} \frac{1}{\lambda_k(W^{(\mathbb{T})}) - z} \mathbf{u}_{ki}(W^{(\mathbb{T})}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{kj}(W^{(\mathbb{T})}) \right| \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \leq C$$

with some positive constant C . And we also have

$$\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} |\mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{T})}(z)| = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^M \frac{1}{|\lambda_l(W^{(\mathbb{T})}) - z|} \leq O(\eta^{-1}) \sim 1.$$

Thus we conclude the proof. $\square$

Now we come to verify Lemma 3.5.

Proof of Lemma 3.5. At first, we claim it suffices to show that for any fixed $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$ with $\eta \sim 1$, there is some positive constant C_ζ independent of z such that

$$\max \left\{ \Lambda_o(z), \max_i |G_{ii}(z) - m_N(z)|, \max_i |T_i(z)|, \max_i |R_i(z)|, \max_i |v_{1i}(z)| \right\} < \varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi(z) \quad (3.15)$$

and

$$\max \left\{ \max_i |U_i(z)|, |v_2(z)|, |v_3(z)|, |v_4(z)| \right\} < \varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi^2(z) \quad (3.16)$$

hold with ζ -high probability. At first, by (2.33) we have

$$\|(m_N^{(i)}(z)\Sigma + I)^{-1}\|_{op}, \|m_N(z)\Sigma + I\|_{op} \leq \max\left(\frac{4\|\Sigma\|_{op}}{\eta}, 2\right) \sim 1 \quad (3.17)$$

when $\eta \sim 1$. Moreover, we have already truncated the variables $\sqrt{N}x_{ij}$ at $(\log N)^{C'_0}$. Then it is easy to check the derivatives of the quantities $G_{ij}(z), T_i(z), U_i(z), R_i(z), v_{1i}(z), v_2(z), v_3(z), v_4(z)$ with respect to z are all bounded by η^{-A_0} in magnitude with some positive constant A_0 . Now we can assign an ε -net on the region $S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$ with $\varepsilon = N^{-100A_0}$ (say). Then it suffices to show (3.15) and (3.16) for all z in this ε -net. By the definition of ζ -high probability, it suffices to prove (3.15) and (3.16) for any fixed z .

Note that when $\eta \sim 1$, by using (3.14) we have

$$G_{ii}(z) \sim 1, \quad m_N(z) \sim 1 \quad (3.18)$$

with ζ -high probability. Using Lemma 2.3 and (3.18) we have

$$\Psi(z) = O(N^{-1/2}), \quad \eta \sim 1.$$

By the definition of $\Omega(z, K)$, we should bound the following quantities

$$\begin{aligned} & \Lambda_o(z), \max_i |G_{ii}(z) - m_N(z)|, \max_i |T_i(z)|, \max_i |R_i(z)|, \\ & \max_i |v_{1i}(z)|, \max_i |U_i(z)|, |v_2(z)|, |v_3(z)|, |v_4(z)| \end{aligned}$$

when $\eta \sim 1$ one by one. We do it as follows.

At first, we remind here the basic inequality

$$\|AB\|_{HS} \leq \|A\|_{op}\|B\|_{HS} \quad (3.19)$$

for any two matrices A and B . Moreover, we have the following basic bound

$$\text{Tr}G(z) - \text{Tr}G^{(i)}(z) \leq O(\eta^{-1}). \quad (3.20)$$

To see (3.20), we denote the ESD of $W_N^{(i)}$ by $F_N^{(i)}$. Then by Cauchy interlacing property we know

$$\lambda_N(W_N) \leq \lambda_{N-1}(W_N^{(i)}) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_2(W_N) \leq \lambda_1(W_N^{(i)}) \leq \lambda_1(W_N),$$

which implies

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |F_N(x) - F_N^{(i)}(x)| \leq \frac{1}{N}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Tr}G(z) - \text{Tr}G^{(i)}(z)| & \leq N \int \frac{1}{|\lambda - z|} d(F_N(\lambda) - F_N^{(i)}(\lambda)) \\ & \leq \eta^{-1} \int \frac{\eta}{(\lambda - E)^2 + \eta^2} d\lambda = \pi\eta^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

By using formula (ii) of Lemma 3.1, Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.7, we can get that with ζ -high probability,

$$|\Lambda_o(z)| \leq C \max_{i \neq j} |\mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(ij)}(z) \mathbf{r}_j| \leq \max_{i \neq j} \frac{\varphi_{C_\zeta}}{N} \|\Sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{G}^{(ij)}(z) \Sigma^{1/2}\|_{HS}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C \frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{N} \max_{i \neq j} \|\mathcal{G}^{(ij)}(z)\|_{HS} = C \varphi^{C_\zeta} \max_{i \neq j} \sqrt{\frac{\Im \text{Tr} \mathcal{G}^{(ij)}(z)}{N^2 \eta}} \\
&= C \varphi^{C_\zeta} \max_{i \neq j} \sqrt{\frac{\Im \text{Tr} G^{(ij)}(z)}{N^2 \eta} + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)} = C \varphi^{C_\zeta} \sqrt{\frac{\Im m_N(z)}{N \eta} + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Here in the last step we have used the fact that $\eta \sim 1$ and

$$\left| \text{Tr} G(z) - \text{Tr} G^{(ij)}(z) \right| \leq \left| \text{Tr} G(z) - \text{Tr} G^{(i)}(z) \right| + \left| \text{Tr} G^{(i)}(z) - \text{Tr} G^{(ij)}(z) \right| \leq O(\eta^{-1}).$$

Now by (3.22) and the fact that $\eta \sim 1$ and thus

$$\Im m_N(z) \sim 1$$

with ζ -high probability, we have

$$|\Lambda_o(z)| \leq C \frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{N} \max_{i \neq j} \|\mathcal{G}^{(ij)}(z)\|_{HS} \leq O(\varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi(z)) \tag{3.23}$$

with ζ -high probability. Similarly, we also have

$$\frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{N} \max_i \|\mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z)\|_{HS} \leq O(\varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi(z))$$

with ζ -high probability.

For Λ_d , we start from the observation

$$\max_i |G_{ii} - m_N| \leq \max_{i \neq j} |G_{ii} - G_{jj}|, \tag{3.24}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned}
|G_{ii} - G_{jj}| &= \left| \frac{1}{-z - z \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \mathbf{r}_i} - \frac{1}{-z - z \mathbf{r}_j^* \mathcal{G}^{(j)} \mathbf{r}_j} \right| \\
&\leq |G_{ii} G_{jj}| \left(|T_i - T_j| + \frac{1}{N} |\text{Tr} \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma - \text{Tr} \mathcal{G}^{(j)} \Sigma| \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where T_i is defined in (3.6). Note that by using Lemma 3.4 again, we have

$$|T_i(z)| \leq \varphi^{C_\zeta} \frac{1}{N} \|\mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z) \Sigma\|_{HS} \leq C \varphi^{C_\zeta} \frac{1}{N} \|\mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z)\|_{HS} = O(\varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi(z)) \tag{3.25}$$

with ζ -high probability. Here the last step can be obtained by a similar calculation as that for (3.23). Moreover, we have

$$\frac{1}{N} |\text{Tr} \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z) \Sigma - \text{Tr} \mathcal{G}^{(j)}(z) \Sigma| \leq |U_i(z)| + |U_j(z)| \tag{3.26}$$

Therefore, we come to estimate $U_i(z)$ below. Now using the Sherman-Morrison formula

$$(A + \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_j^*)^{-1} = A^{-1} - \frac{A^{-1} \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_j^* A^{-1}}{1 + \mathbf{r}_j^* A^{-1} \mathbf{r}_i} \tag{3.27}$$

for any $M \times M$ invertible matrix A , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |U_i(z)| &= \frac{1}{N} |Tr \left(\mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z) - \mathcal{G}(z) \right) \Sigma| = \frac{1}{N} \left| \frac{\mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \mathbf{r}_i}{1 + \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \mathbf{r}_i} \right| = \frac{1}{N} |z G_{ii}(z)| \left| \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \mathbf{r}_i \right| \\ &\leq C \frac{1}{N} \left(\left| \frac{1}{N} Tr \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma \right| + \frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{N} \|\mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma\|_{HS} \right) \end{aligned}$$

with ζ -high probability, where the last step above follows from Lemma 3.4.

Observe that

$$\left| Tr \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma \right| \leq Tr \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma^2 (\mathcal{G}^{(i)})^* \leq C \|\mathcal{G}^{(i)}\|_{HS}^2.$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma\|_{HS} \leq C \|(\mathcal{G}^{(i)})^2\|_{HS} \leq C \|\mathcal{G}^{(i)}\|_{HS}^2.$$

Therefore we have

$$|U_i(z)| \leq C \varphi^{C_\zeta} \frac{1}{N^2} \|\mathcal{G}^{(i)}\|_{HS}^2 = \varphi^{C_\zeta} \frac{\Im Tr \mathcal{G}^{(i)}}{N^2 \eta} = O(\varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi^2(z)) \quad (3.28)$$

with ζ -high probability. Thus (3.24)-(3.28) imply that

$$\max_i |G_{ii}(z) - m_N(z)| = O(\varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi(z))$$

with ζ -high probability.

Hence, it remains to bound

$$R_i(z), \quad v_{1i}(z), \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad \text{and} \quad v_k(z), \quad k = 2, 3, 4.$$

To bound these quantities, we recall (3.17). For $v_{1i}(z)$, we use Lemma 3.4 again, thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_i |v_{1i}(z)| &\leq \max_i \left| \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma (m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \mathbf{r}_i - \frac{1}{N} Tr(m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z) \Sigma \right| \\ &\leq \max_i \frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{N} \|(m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z) \Sigma\|_{HS} \\ &\leq C \max_i \frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{N} \|\mathcal{G}^{(i)}\|_{HS} = O(\varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi(z)) \end{aligned}$$

with ζ -high probability, where the last inequality above follows from (3.17). Similarly we can get that

$$|R_i(z)| = O(\varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi(z))$$

with ζ -high probability.

For $v_2(z)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |v_2(z)| &\leq C \max_i \left| \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z) \Sigma \left[(m_N(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} - (m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \right] \mathbf{r}_i \right| \\ &= \max_i \left| \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z) \Sigma (m_N(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} (m_N(z) - m_N^{(i)}(z)) \Sigma (m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \mathbf{r}_i \right| \\ &\leq \max_i |m_N(z) - m_N^{(i)}(z)| \left(\left| Tr \mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z) \Sigma (m_N(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma (m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma \right| \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \varphi^{C_\zeta} \|\mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z) \Sigma (m_N(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma (m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma\|_{HS} \Big) \\
& \leq C \max_i |m_N(z) - m_N^{(i)}(z)| \left(\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} |\mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z)| + \frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{N} \|\mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z)\|_{HS} \right) \\
& \leq C |\Lambda_o(z)|^2 = O(\varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi^2(z)). \tag{3.29}
\end{aligned}$$

with ζ -high probability. Here in the last inequality above we have used the fact that

$$|m_N(z) - m_N^{(i)}(z)| = O((\Lambda_o(z))^2)$$

which is implied by (3.14) and (iii) of Lemma 3.1.

For $v_3(z)$, we can use the same approach as what we have used to bound $U_i(z)$ in (3.28). Actually by using (3.27) and (3.14) again, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|v_3(z)| & \leq C \max_i \left| \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \left(\mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z) - \mathcal{G}(z) \right) \Sigma (m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma \right| \\
& = C \max_i \frac{1}{N} |z G_{ii}(z)| \left| \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma (m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \mathbf{r}_i \right| \\
& \leq C \varphi^{C_\zeta} \max_i \frac{1}{N^2} \|\mathcal{G}^{(i)}\|_{HS}^2 = \varphi^{C_\zeta} \max_i \frac{\Im \text{Tr} \mathcal{G}^{(i)}}{N^2 \eta} = O(\varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi^2(z)) \tag{3.30}
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the estimate of $v_4(z)$ is similar to that of $v_2(z)$. Actually, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|v_4(z)| & \leq \max_i \left| \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} (m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma \mathcal{G}(z) \Sigma - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} (m_N(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma \mathcal{G}(z) \Sigma \right| \\
& \leq C \max_i |m_N(z) - m_N^{(i)}(z)| = O(\Lambda_o^2) = O(\varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi^2(z)).
\end{aligned}$$

with ζ -high probability. Thus we conclude the proof of Lemma 3.5. $\square$

With the aid of Lemma 3.5, we can prove Lemma 3.6 below.

Proof of Lemma 3.6. Similar to the discussion in the proof of Lemma 3.5, it suffices to estimate $\Lambda(z)$ for a fixed z . At first, we pursue the idea in [30] to introduce the function

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}(u)(z) & = \left((u(z))^{-1} - d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t}{tu(z) + 1} dH_N(t) \right) \\
& \quad - \left((m_0(z))^{-1} - d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t}{tm_0(z) + 1} dH_N(t) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that by the fact

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (G_{ii}(z) - m_N(z)) = 0,$$

it is not difficult to see that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N ((G_{ii}(z))^{-1} - (m_N(z))^{-1})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_N(z) - G_{ii}(z)}{m_N^2(z)} + O\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(G_{ii}(z) - m_N(z))^2}{G_{ii}(z)m_N^2(z)}\right) \\
&= O\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(G_{ii}(z) - m_N(z))^2}{G_{ii}(z)m_N^2(z)}\right) = O(\varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi^2(z))
\end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

with ζ -high probability by using Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.7. By the fact that

$$(G_{ii}(z))^{-1} = -z + d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t}{tm_N(z) + 1} dH_N(t) - Y_i$$

(3.31) and (1.11) we have

$$|\mathcal{D}(m_N(z))| \leq |[Y]| + \varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi^2(z)$$

with ζ -high probability, where

$$[Y] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i.$$

Therefore by the definition of $\mathcal{D}(u(z))$ and the bounds for $|Y_i|$, we know that in the case of $\eta \sim 1$, there exists

$$\left| ((m_N(z))^{-1} - (m_0(z))^{-1}) + d_N^{-1} \int \left(\frac{t}{tm_0(z) + 1} - \frac{t}{tm_N(z) + 1} \right) dH_N(t) \right| \leq \varphi^{C_\zeta} \frac{1}{(N\eta)^{1/2}}$$

with ζ -high probability. Taking the fact that $m_0(z), m_N(z) \sim 1$ into account we obtain

$$(m_0(z) - m_N(z)) \left[1 - d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^2 m_N(z) m_0(z)}{(tm_N(z) + 1)(tm_0(z) + 1)} dH_N(t) \right] = \delta_0(z) \tag{3.32}$$

with some function

$$|\delta_0(z)| \leq \varphi^{C_\zeta} \frac{1}{(N\eta)^{1/2}} \tag{3.33}$$

with ζ -high probability. Now we need to estimate

$$1 - d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^2 m_N(z) m_0(z)}{(tm_N(z) + 1)(tm_0(z) + 1)} dH_N(t)$$

when $\eta \sim 1$.

Note that by Cauchy Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^2 m_N(z) m_0(z)}{(tm_N(z) + 1)(tm_0(z) + 1)} dH_N(t) \right| \\
&\leq \left(\int \frac{d_N^{-1} t^2 |m_N(z)|^2}{|tm_N(z) + 1|^2} dH_N(t) \right)^{1/2} \cdot \left(\int \frac{d_N^{-1} t^2 |m_0(z)|^2}{|tm_0(z) + 1|^2} dH_N(t) \right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now by (1.11) we have

$$1 + zm_0(z) - d_N^{-1} \int \frac{tm_0(z)}{tm_0(z) + 1} dH_N(t) = 0,$$

we have

$$\overline{m_0(z)} + z|m_0(z)|^2 - d_N^{-1}|m_0(z)|^2 \int \frac{t}{tm_0(z) + 1} dH_N(t) = 0.$$

Taking the imaginary part of the above equation we obtain

$$-\Im m_0(z) + \eta|m_0(z)|^2 + d_N^{-1}|m_0(z)|^2 \int \frac{t^2 \Im m_0(z)}{|tm_0(z) + 1|^2} dH_N(t) = 0,$$

which implies

$$0 \leq d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^2 |m_0(z)|^2}{|tm_0(z) + 1|^2} dH_N(t) = 1 - \frac{|m_0(z)|^2}{\Im m_0(z)} \eta < 1 - \delta \quad (3.34)$$

for some positive constant δ . Here we have used the fact that $\eta \sim 1$ and (i) of Lemma 2.3. Similarly, by the facts

$$(m_N(z))^{-1} - d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t}{tm_0(z) + 1} dH_N(t) + z = \delta_0$$

and $m_N(z) \sim 1$ with ζ -high probability when $\eta \sim 1$, we can obtain

$$0 \leq d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^2 |m_N(z)|^2}{|tm_N(z) + 1|^2} dH_N(t) = 1 - \frac{|m_N(z)|^2}{\Im m_N(z)} (\eta - \Im \delta'_0(z)) < 1$$

with ζ -high probability, where $\delta'_0(z)$ is some function such that $|\delta'_0(z)| \leq \varphi^{C_\zeta}/(N\eta)^{1/2}$. Here we have used the fact that $\eta \sim 1$ and the bound (3.33).

Therefore we have

$$\left| 1 - d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^2 m_N(z) m_0(z)}{(tm_N(z) + 1)(tm_0(z) + 1)} dH_N(t) \right| \geq c_0 \quad (3.35)$$

for some positive constant c_0 . Hence, by (3.32), (3.33) and (3.35) we have

$$\Lambda(z) \leq \varphi^{C_\zeta} \frac{1}{(N\eta)^{1/2}}.$$

Thus we complete the proof. $\square$

Now, we consider to extend the results to the case of $\eta \ll 1$. To this end, we will provide the desired bounds ((3.15) and (3.16)) with the condition that event $\Xi^c(z)$ happens at first, then we prove event $\Xi^c(z)$ holds with ζ -high probability. Such an strategy is also parallel to that of the null case in [30]. Similar to Lemma 3.5, we now need the following lemma for the first step.

Lemma 3.8. *Under Condition 1.1 and (3.3), for any $\zeta > 0$, there exists a positive constant C_ζ such that*

$$\bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)} \Gamma(z, \varphi^{C_\zeta})$$

with ζ -high probability.

To prove Lemma 3.8, we will need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.9. For $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$, when the event $\Xi^c(z)$ happens, for any $G_{ij}^{(\mathbb{T})}(z)$ with $|\mathbb{T}| = O(1)$ and $i, j \notin \mathbb{T}$ we have

$$\max_{i \notin \mathbb{T}} |G_{ii}^{(\mathbb{T})} - G_{ii}| = O(\Lambda_o^2), \quad G_{ii}^{(\mathbb{T})} \sim 1, \quad \Lambda_o^{(\mathbb{T})} := \max_{i \neq j, i, j \notin \mathbb{T}} |G_{ij}^{(\mathbb{T})}(z)| \leq C\Lambda_o, \quad (3.36)$$

with ζ -high probability.

Proof. Note that when the event $\Xi^c(z)$ happens, we have

$$G_{ii} \sim 1, \quad \Lambda_o(z) \leq (\log N)^{-1}.$$

Now by formula (iii) of Lemma 3.1 and induction, we can easily conclude the proof. $\square$

Now we come to show Lemma 3.8

Proof of Lemma 3.8. At first, we use the discussion in the proof of Lemma 3.5 again to claim that it suffices to prove the result for any fixed $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$.

By the definition in (3.13), it suffices to show that (3.15) and (3.16) hold with ζ -high probability in $\Xi^c(z)$. That means, we need to go back to the proof process of Lemma 3.5. But this time we have the condition that $\Xi^c(z)$ happens instead of $\eta \sim 1$. Note that by definition, in $\Xi^c(z)$ we have

$$\Lambda(z) \leq \Lambda_d(z) \leq (\log N)^{-1}.$$

Using (i) of Lemma 2.3, we have

$$m_N(z) \sim 1, \quad G_{ii}(z) \sim 1, \quad \text{in } \Xi^c(z). \quad (3.37)$$

Note that in the proof of Lemma 3.5, every term except for $v_2(z)$ and $v_4(z)$ can finally be bounded by some quantity in terms of $\max_{i \neq j} \|\mathcal{G}^{(ij)}\|_{HS}$ or $\max_i \|\mathcal{G}^{(i)}\|_{HS}$. Therefore, at first we come to bound $\|\mathcal{G}^{(ij)}\|_{HS}$ and $\|\mathcal{G}^{(i)}\|_{HS}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{G}^{(ij)}\|_{HS} &= \sqrt{\frac{\Im \text{Tr} \mathcal{G}^{(ij)}}{\eta}} = \sqrt{\frac{\Im \text{Tr} G^{(ij)}}{\eta}} + O(N) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{\Im \text{Tr} G}{\eta} + O\left(\frac{N\Lambda_o^2}{\eta}\right)} + O(N), \end{aligned} \quad (3.38)$$

where the last step follows from (3.36). Now similar to (3.23), with the aid of (3.37), we see in $\Xi^c(z)$, there exists

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_o(z) &\leq C \frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{N} \max_{i \neq j} \|\mathcal{G}^{(ij)}(z)\|_{HS} \leq C \varphi^{C_\zeta} \sqrt{\frac{\Im m_N(z)}{N\eta} + O\left(\frac{\Lambda_o^2}{N\eta}\right)} + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \\ &= C \varphi^{C_\zeta} \sqrt{\frac{\Im m_N(z)}{N\eta} + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)} + o(\Lambda_o), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$. Thus by (iii) of Lemma 2.3 we have

$$\Lambda_o(z) \leq \varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi(z) \quad (3.39)$$

with ζ -high probability in $\Xi^c(z)$. Inserting (3.39) into (3.38), we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \|\mathcal{G}^{(ij)}(z)\|_{HS} \leq \Psi(z) \quad (3.40)$$

with ζ -high probability in $\Xi^c(z)$. Analogously, we also have

$$\frac{1}{N} \|\mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z)\|_{HS} \leq \Psi(z) \quad (3.41)$$

with ζ -high probability in $\Xi^c(z)$

With the aid of (3.37), (3.40) and (3.41) it is not difficult to see (by using Lemma 3.9) the estimates between (3.23) and (3.28) are still valid in $\Xi^c(z)$ for all $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$.

Therefore, it remains to estimate R_i , v_{1i} and v_2, v_3, v_4 . Actually, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.10. *Under Condition 1.1, for any $\zeta > 0$, there exists a constant $C_\zeta > 0$, when $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$, we have with ζ -high probability,*

$$\|(m_N^{(i)}(z)\Sigma + I)^{-1}\|_{op}, \|(m_N(z)\Sigma + I)^{-1}\|_{op}, \|(m_0(z)\Sigma + I)^{-1}\|_{op} \leq C_\zeta, \quad \text{in } \Xi^c(z). \quad (3.42)$$

Moreover, we have with ζ -high probability,

$$\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} |\mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z)| \leq (\log N)^{O(1)}, \text{ for all } z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta). \quad (3.43)$$

Note that by the estimates for R_i , v_{1i} and v_2, v_3, v_4 in the proof of Lemma 3.5, we can easily see that once Lemma 3.10 holds, Lemma 3.8 follows. Actually, with the aid of Lemma 3.10, we can easily check that

$$|v_2|, |v_3|, |v_4| \leq O(\varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi^2), \quad |R_i|, |v_{1i}| \leq O(\varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi), \quad k = 1, \dots, N \quad (3.44)$$

with ζ -high probability in $\Xi^c(z)$.

Hence, it suffices to prove Lemma 3.10 below. To this end, we need the following crude bound on the counting function of eigenvalues. Hereafter, we will use $N_I(A)$ to denote the number of the eigenvalues of an Hermitian matrix A in the interval I .

Lemma 3.11. *Under Condition 1.1, for any $\zeta > 0$ there exists some constant $C_\zeta > 0$ such that for any interval $I \subset [C_l, \infty)$ with length $|I| \geq \varphi^{5C_\zeta}/N$, we have*

$$N_I(\mathcal{W}) \leq C_\zeta N |I| \quad (3.45)$$

with ζ -high probability.

Proof. Let $\eta \geq \varphi^{5C_\zeta}/N$. Note that for any interval $I = [E - \eta/2, E + \eta/2] \subset [C_l, \infty]$ (thus $E - \eta/2 \geq C_l$) we have the elementary inequality

$$N_I(\mathcal{W}) \leq CN\eta \Im m_N(z), \quad z = E + i\eta,$$

thus

$$N_I(\mathcal{W}) \leq C\eta \sum_{i=1}^N \Im G_{ii}(z).$$

Now we assume $N_I(\mathcal{W}) > C_\zeta N\eta$ for any large constant C_ζ to get a contradiction. It suffices to show for any $\zeta > 0$, there exists a positive constant C'_ζ such that

$$|\Im G_{ii}(z)| \leq C'_\zeta \quad (3.46)$$

with ζ -high probability if $N_I(\mathcal{W}) > C_\zeta N\eta$. To verify (3.46) under the assumption of $N_I(\mathcal{W}) > C_\zeta N\eta$, we rewrite (i) of Lemma 3.1 as

$$G_{ii} = -\frac{1}{z + z \sum_{k=1}^M \frac{1}{\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}^{(i)} - z)} |\langle \mathbf{u}_k(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}), \mathbf{r}_i \rangle|^2},$$

where $\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}) \geq \lambda_2(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_M(\mathcal{W}^{(i)})$ are the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{W}^{(i)}$ and $\mathbf{u}_k(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}), k = 1, \dots, M$ are their corresponding unit eigenvectors. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Im G_{ii}(z) &\leq \frac{1}{\eta + \eta \sum_{k=1}^M \frac{\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}^{(i)})}{(\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}) - E)^2 + \eta^2} |\langle \mathbf{u}_k(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}), \mathbf{r}_i \rangle|^2} \\ &\leq \frac{C\eta}{C_l \sum_{k: |\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}) - E| \leq \eta/2} |\langle \mathbf{u}_k(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}), \mathbf{r}_i \rangle|^2} \end{aligned} \quad (3.47)$$

with ζ -high probability. Now by Cauchy interlacing property again we know for any interval I there exists

$$|N_I(\mathcal{W}_N) - N_I(\mathcal{W}_N^{(i)})| \leq 1.$$

Thus by assumption, we have

$$|N_I(\mathcal{W}_N^{(i)})| = \#\{k : |\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}) - E| \leq \eta/2\} \geq C_\zeta N\eta$$

with some sufficiently large C_ζ . Now we set the projection matrix

$$P_z := \sum_{k: |\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}) - E| \leq \eta/2} \mathbf{u}_k(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}) (\mathbf{u}_k(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}))^*.$$

By assumption we have

$$\text{Tr} P_z = \text{Tr} P_z^2 \geq C_\zeta N\eta.$$

Thus by Lemma 3.4, there exists

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k: |\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}) - E| \leq \eta/2} |\langle \mathbf{u}_k(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}), \mathbf{r}_i \rangle|^2 &= X_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} P_z \Sigma^{1/2} X_i \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \Sigma^{1/2} P_z \Sigma^{1/2} + O\left(\frac{\varphi^{C\zeta}}{N} \|\Sigma^{1/2} P_z \Sigma^{1/2}\|_{HS}\right) \geq C''_\zeta \eta \end{aligned}$$

with ζ -high probability for some positive constant C''_ζ . Thus by (3.47) we see that (3.46) holds with ζ -high probability. Therefore we conclude the proof. $\square$

Now we come to prove Lemma 3.10.

Proof of Lemma 3.10. At first, we come to show (3.43). By definition we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} |\mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z)| = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^M \frac{1}{|\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}) - z|},$$

Recall the fact that for any interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$,

$$|N_I(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}) - N_I(\mathcal{W})| \leq 1. \quad (3.48)$$

Note that when $z = E + i\eta \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$ one has $\eta \geq \varphi^{5C_\zeta}/N$. Now we split $\mathbb{R}$ into

$$\mathbb{R} = (-\infty, \lambda_r - 2\tilde{c}) \cup \left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{K_n} I_k \right) \cup (C_r, \infty) := I_0 \cup \left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{K_n} I_k \right) \cup I_{K_n+1},$$

where $K_n = O(\eta^{-1})$ and I_k are non-intersecting intervals with $|I_k| = \eta, k = 1, \dots, K_n$. Specifically,

$$I_1 := [\lambda_r - 2\tilde{c}, \lambda_r - 2\tilde{c} + \eta).$$

Now we write

$$\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} |\mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z)| = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{K_n+1} \sum_{l: \lambda_l(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}) \in I_k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(\lambda_l(\mathcal{W}^{(i)}) - E)^2 + \eta^2}}.$$

Then for $z = E + i\eta \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$, by invoking Lemma 3.11 and (3.48) we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} |\mathcal{G}^{(i)}(z)| \leq \log^{O(1)} N$$

with ζ -high probability.

Now we start to show (3.42). Note that in $\Xi^c(z)$, we have

$$|m_N(z) - m_0(z)|, |m_N^{(i)}(z) - m_0(z)| \leq (\log N)^{-1}.$$

Therefore, it suffices to show that

$$\|(m_0(z)\Sigma + I)^{-1}\|_{op} = O(1), \text{ for } z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta), \quad (3.49)$$

which follows from (iv) of Lemma 2.3 immediately. $\square$

Therefore, we conclude the proof of Lemma 3.8 $\square$

Moreover, by definitions we also have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.12. *Let K be some positive number such that $1 \leq K \ll (N\eta)^{1/2}$. Then for $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$, in $\Gamma(z, K)$ we have*

$$|\mathcal{D}(m_N)(z)| \leq |Y| + O(K^2\Psi^2(z)) + \infty \mathbf{1}_{\Xi^c(z)}. \quad (3.50)$$

Proof. Note that by the assumption on K , we have

$$K\Psi \ll 1, \quad \text{in } \Xi^c(z).$$

Hence, by the fact that $G_{ii}(z), m_N(z) \sim 1$ in $\Xi^c(z)$ it is not difficult to see

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N (G_{ii}(z))^{-1} &= (m_N(z))^{-1} + O(\max_i |G_{ii}(z) - m_N(z)|^2) \\ &= (m_N(z))^{-1} + O(K^2\Psi^2(z)), \text{ in } \Omega^c(z, K) \cap \Xi^c(z) \end{aligned}$$

from (3.31). Moreover, we recall the identity

$$(G_{ii}(z))^{-1} = -z + d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t}{tm_N(z) + 1} dH_N(t) - Y_i,$$

which implies

$$(m_N(z))^{-1} = -z + d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t}{tm_N(z) + 1} dH_N(t) - [Y] + O(K^2 \Psi^2(z)), \text{ in } \Omega^c(z, K) \cap \Xi^c(z).$$

Then by the definition of $\mathcal{D}(u(z))$ we obtain

$$|\mathcal{D}(m_N(z))| \leq |[Y]| + O(K^2 \Psi^2(z)), \text{ in } \Omega^c(z, K) \cap \Xi^c(z),$$

which implies (3.50) in $\Gamma(z, K)$. $\square$

Now we are on the stage to extend the estimate on $\Lambda(z)$ to the case of $\eta \ll 1$. Actually, we have the following crucial Lemma which is an extension of Lemma 6.12 of [30] to our non-null case.

Lemma 3.13. *Let $K = \varphi^{O(1)}$ and $L = O(1)$ be two positive numbers satisfying*

$$\varphi^L \geq K^2 (\log N)^4.$$

And let $\mathbf{S}$ be an event satisfying

$$\mathbf{S} \subset \bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L)} \Gamma(z, K) \cap \bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L), \eta=1} \Xi^c(z).$$

Assume that in $\mathbf{S}$ one has

$$|\mathcal{D}(m_N(z))| \leq \delta(z) + \infty \mathbf{1}_{\Xi(z)}, \text{ for all } z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L),$$

where $\delta : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x > 0\}$ is a continuous function. Moreover, $\delta(z)$ is decreasing in η and $|\delta(z)| \leq (\log N)^{-\delta}$. Then there exists some positive constant C such that

$$\Lambda(z) \leq C(\log N) \frac{\delta(z)}{\sqrt{\kappa + \eta + \delta(z)}}, \text{ for all } z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L) \quad (3.51)$$

holds in $\mathbf{S}$ and

$$\mathbf{S} \subset \bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L)} \Xi^c(z). \quad (3.52)$$

Proof. Note that we need to prove (3.51) and (3.52). By definition of $\Xi(z)$ it suffices to prove that (3.51) holds when

$$\Lambda_o(z) + \Lambda_d(z) \leq (\log N)^{-1} \quad (3.53)$$

and then prove (3.53) holds for all $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L)$ when the event $\mathbf{S}$ occurs. To this end, we define the set of η

$$I_E := \{\eta : \Lambda_o(E + i\eta) + \Lambda_d(E + i\eta) \leq (\log N)^{-1}, \forall \eta \geq \eta, E + i\eta \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L)\}$$

At first, we come to show that (3.51) holds for $z = E + i\eta$ with $\eta \in I_E$. By assumption, we have

$$|\mathcal{D}(m_N(E + i\eta))| \leq \delta(E + i\eta), \quad \forall \eta \in I_E.$$

Note that when $\eta \in I_E$, we have

$$m_N(z) = m_0(z) + O((\log N)^{-1}) \sim 1 \quad (3.54)$$

Thus similar to (3.32), by the definition of $\mathcal{D}(u)(z)$ here we also have

$$(m_0(z) - m_N(z)) \left[1 - d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^2 m_N(z) m_0(z)}{(tm_N(z) + 1)(tm_0(z) + 1)} dH_N(t) \right] = \delta_0(z), \quad (3.55)$$

with

$$|\delta_0(z)| \leq O(\delta(z)), \quad \eta \in I_E.$$

Similarly, in order to obtain a bound for Λ , we need to derive an estimate towards the quantity

$$\left| 1 - d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^2 m_N(z) m_0(z)}{(tm_N(z) + 1)(tm_0(z) + 1)} dH_N(t) \right|.$$

However, unlike (3.35) whose estimation is based on the fact of $\eta \sim 1$, we need to do it for general η this time. Thus more delicate calculation should be taken.

At first, by the discussion towards (3.32), we see (3.51) holds naturally when $\eta \sim 1$. Therefore, in the sequel, we will assume $\eta \leq \hat{\eta}$ for some sufficiently small constant $\hat{\eta}$. Now we can write (3.55) as

$$\begin{aligned} & (m_0(z) - m_N(z)) \\ & \times \left[1 - d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^2 m_0^2(z) dH_N(t)}{(tm_0(z) + 1)^2} + d_N^{-1} (m_0(z) - m_N(z)) \int \frac{t^2 m_0(z) dH_N(t)}{(tm_N(z) + 1)(tm_0(z) + 1)^2} \right] \\ & = \delta_0(z). \end{aligned} \quad (3.56)$$

By (i) and (iv) of Lemma 2.3 and (3.54), we have

$$\left| \int \frac{t^2 m_0(z)}{(tm_N(z) + 1)(tm_0(z) + 1)^2} dH_N(t) \right| \leq C, \text{ for } z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L). \quad (3.57)$$

for some positive constant C . Now we come to show that when $\eta \leq \hat{\eta}$ and $\tilde{c}$ is chosen to be sufficiently small, we also have

$$\left| \int \frac{t^2 m_0(z)}{(tm_N(z) + 1)(tm_0(z) + 1)^2} dH_N(t) \right| \geq C^{-1}, \text{ for } z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L) \quad (3.58)$$

for some sufficiently large positive constant C . Note that by using (i) and (iv) of Lemma 2.3 and (3.54) again, it is easy to see

$$\left| \int \frac{t^2}{(tm_N(z) + 1)(tm_0(z) + 1)^2} dH_N(t) - \int \frac{t^2}{(tm_0(z) + 1)^3} dH_N(t) \right| = O((\log N)^{-1})$$

when $\eta \in I_E$. Thus it suffices to show that when $\eta \leq \hat{\eta}$ and $\tilde{c}$ is chosen to be sufficiently small, there exists

$$\left| \int \frac{t^2}{(tm_0(z) + 1)^3} dH_N(t) \right| \geq C^{-1}, \text{ for } z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L)$$

For convenience we set

$$\mathcal{J}(t) := tm_0(z) + 1.$$

Note that by (iv) of Lemma 2.3, we know both $\Re \mathcal{J}(t)$ and $\Im \mathcal{J}(t)$ are positive when $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L)$. Let

$$\theta(t) := \arg(\mathcal{J}(t)) \in (0, \pi/2).$$

It is not difficult to see from the proof of (iv) of Lemma 2.3 that if $\tilde{c}$ is chosen to be sufficiently small, we can guarantee that the parameter c_0 therein is much larger than $\tilde{c}$. Then by (ii) of Lemma 2.3, when $\eta \geq \hat{\eta}$ we also have

$$\Im m_0(z) \leq C\sqrt{\tilde{c} + \hat{\eta}}.$$

Therefore, when $\hat{\eta}$ and $\tilde{c}$ are sufficiently small, we have that $\Re \mathcal{J}(t)$ is much larger than $\Im \mathcal{J}(t)$ such that $\theta(t) \leq \pi/18$ (say). That means we have

$$0 < (\theta(t))^3 \leq \pi/6, \quad \text{thus} \quad \Re(\mathcal{J}(t))^3 \geq \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{J}(t)|^3$$

when $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L)$. Then it is easy to see

$$\left| \int \frac{t^2}{(tm_0(z) + 1)^3} dH_N(t) \right| \geq \Re \int \frac{t^2}{(tm_0(z) + 1)^3} dH_N(t) \geq C^{-1}$$

for some positive constant C . Then (3.57) and (3.58) together imply that

$$\int \frac{t^2 m_0(z)}{(tm_N(z) + 1)(tm_0(z) + 1)^2} dH_N(t) \sim 1, \quad z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L), \quad \eta \in I_E, \quad \eta \leq \hat{\eta}$$

when $\hat{\eta}$ and $\tilde{c}$ are sufficiently small. Therefore, by (3.56) we have

$$a(z)(m_0(z) - m_N(z))^2 + (1 - b(z))(m_0(z) - m_N(z)) = \delta_0(z), \quad (3.59)$$

where

$$a(z) \sim 1, \quad b(z) = d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^2 m_0^2(z)}{(tm_0(z) + 1)^2} dH_N(t).$$

Now we need to provide an upper bound on

$$|1 - b(z)|.$$

Recall the formula in (3.34) and set

$$c(z) := d_N^{-1} \int \frac{t^2 |m_0(z)|^2}{|tm_0(z) + 1|^2} dH_N(t) = 1 - \frac{|m_0(z)|^2}{\Im m_0(z)} \eta < 1. \quad (3.60)$$

Note that since $1 > c(z) > |b(z)|$, it is obvious that

$$|1 - b(z)| \geq \max\{1 - c(z), |c(z) - b(z)|\}. \quad (3.61)$$

Thus it suffices to estimate the quantity

$$|c(z) - b(z)|.$$

To this end, we learn an idea in [12] which is provided for studying the stability of the Stieltjes transform of $\mathcal{W}_N$ type matrices in the bulk case. Actually, we can extend the discussion in [12] to the edge case for our model as well. For ease of presentation, we set

$$\mathcal{F}(t) = \frac{tm_0(z)}{tm_0(z) + 1}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
|c(z) - b(z)| &= d_N^{-1} \left| \int (|\mathcal{F}(t)|^2 - \mathcal{F}^2(t)) dH_N(t) \right| \\
&= d_N^{-1} \left| 2 \int (\Im \mathcal{F}(t))^2 dH_N(t) - 2i \int \Re \mathcal{F}(t) \Im \mathcal{F}(t) dH_N(t) \right| \\
&\geq 2d_N^{-1} \int (\Im \mathcal{F}(t))^2 dH_N(t) \\
&\geq C(\Im m_0(z))^2 \int |\mathcal{F}(t)|^2 dH_N(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the relation

$$\frac{\Im \mathcal{F}(t)}{|\mathcal{F}(t)|} = \frac{\Im m_0(z)}{|tm_0(z) + 1||m_0(z)|}, \quad (3.62)$$

and the fact that

$$m_0(z) \sim 1, \quad 1 + tm_0(z) \sim 1, \quad \text{for } z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 0), \quad t \in \text{Spec}(\Sigma). \quad (3.63)$$

Moreover, by definition and (3.63) we also have

$$\int |\mathcal{F}(t)|^2 dH_N(t) \sim 1.$$

Therefore, if $\Im m_0(z) \sim 1$, we have

$$|c(z) - b(z)| \sim \Im m_0(z). \quad (3.64)$$

If $\Im m_0(z) \leq \epsilon$ for some sufficiently small constant $\epsilon > 0$, we need to estimate $|c(z) - b(z)|$ as follows. Set

$$\mathcal{F}(t) = e^{i\phi(t)} |\mathcal{F}(t)|.$$

From (3.62) we see $\Im \mathcal{F}(t) > 0$, thus we have $\phi \in (0, \pi)$. By the assumption of $\Im m_0(z) \leq \epsilon$, (3.62) and (3.63) we obtain

$$\sin \phi \leq C\epsilon,$$

thus

$$|\cos \phi| \geq 1/2$$

for sufficiently small ϵ . Moreover, by (iv) of Lemma 2.3 and continuity, we have either $\cos \phi \geq 1/2$ or $\cos \phi \leq -1/2$ holds uniformly on $t \in [\lambda_M(\Sigma), \lambda_1(\Sigma)]$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|c(z) - b(z)| &= d_N^{-1} \left| \int |\mathcal{F}(t)|^2 - \mathcal{F}^2(t) dH_N(t) \right| \\
&= 2d_N^{-1} \left| \int |\mathcal{F}(t)|^2 e^{i\phi} \sin \phi dH_N(t) \right| \\
&\geq 2d_N^{-1} \left| \int |\mathcal{F}(t)|^2 \cos \phi \sin \phi dH_N(t) \right| - 2d_N^{-1} \int |\mathcal{F}(t)|^2 \sin^2 \phi dH_N(t) \\
&\geq d_N^{-1} \int |\mathcal{F}(t)|^2 (\sin \phi - 2 \sin^2 \phi) dH_N(t)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq (2d_N)^{-1} \int |\mathcal{F}(t)|^2 \sin \phi dH_N(t) \\
&\geq c\Im m_0(z) \int |\mathcal{F}(t)|^2 dH_N(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.65}$$

where in the last step we have used (3.62) and the fact that $\sin \phi = \Im \mathcal{F}(t)/\mathcal{F}(t)$. Therefore, by (3.64) and (3.65) we always have

$$|1 - b(z)| = |c(z) - b(z)| \geq \epsilon \Im m_0(z)$$

with some positive constant ϵ . Similar to the analysis in (3.65), when $\Im m_0(z)$ is sufficiently small, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
|c(z) - b(z)| &\leq 2d_N^{-1} \left| \int |\mathcal{F}(t)|^2 \cos \phi \sin \phi dH_N(t) \right| + 2d_N^{-1} \int |\mathcal{F}(t)|^2 \sin^2 \phi dH_N(t) \\
&\leq C \Im m_0(z)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.66}$$

for some positive constant C . Moreover, by (3.60) and (3.61) we also have

$$|1 - b(z)| \geq 1 - c(z) = \frac{|m_0(z)|^2}{\Im m_0(z)} \eta \sim \frac{\eta}{\Im m_0(z)}. \tag{3.67}$$

Thus we have for some positive constants ϵ, ϵ' ,

$$|1 - b(z)| \geq \epsilon \max\left\{\Im m_0(z), \frac{\eta}{\Im m_0(z)}\right\} \geq \epsilon' \sqrt{\kappa + \eta}, \tag{3.68}$$

which is implied by (ii) of Lemma 2.3. Moreover, when $\Im m_0(z)$ is sufficiently small, by (3.66) we also have

$$|1 - b(z)| \leq |1 - c(z)| + |c(z) - b(z)| = O\left(\frac{\eta}{\Im m_0(z)}\right) + O(\Im m_0(z)) = O(\sqrt{\kappa + \eta}) \tag{3.69}$$

Note that the function $\delta(E + i\eta)$ is decreasing in η , thus we can set

$$\eta_1 = \sup_{I_E} \left\{ \eta : \delta(E + i\eta) \geq (\log N)^{-1}(\kappa + \eta) \right\}.$$

Solving (3.59) we obtain two solutions of $m_N(z)$ as $m_{N1}(z)$ and $m_{N2}(z)$ such that

$$m_{N1}(z) - m_0(z) = \frac{-(1 - b(z)) + \sqrt{(1 - b(z))^2 + 4a(z)\delta_0(z)}}{a^2(z)},$$

and

$$m_{N2}(z) - m_0(z) = \frac{-(1 - b(z)) - \sqrt{(1 - b(z))^2 + 4a(z)\delta_0(z)}}{a^2(z)}.$$

Here the square root is chosen to guarantee that

$$\sqrt{(1 - b(z))^2 + 4a(z)\delta_0(z)} = (1 - b(z)) + O(\delta_0(z))$$

when $\eta \sim 1$.

When $\Im m_0(z)$ is small enough, by (3.68) and (3.69) we see that there exists

$$1 - b(z) \sim \sqrt{\kappa + \eta}.$$

Therefore, when $\eta \leq \eta_1$, by definition we have

$$\kappa + \eta \leq (\log N)^{-7}$$

which implies

$$\Im m_0(z) \ll 1$$

by Lemma 2.3. Thus for $\eta \leq \eta_1$, we have

$$|1 - b(z)| \sim \sqrt{\kappa + \eta} \leq C(\log N) \sqrt{\delta(z)}. \quad (3.70)$$

For $\eta > \eta_1$, by the fact that $\delta(z)$ is decreasing in η we know

$$\delta(E + i\eta) \leq (\log N)^{-1}(\kappa + \eta_1) \leq (\log N)^{-1}(\kappa + \eta) \leq C(\log N)^{-1}|1 - b(z)|^2. \quad (3.71)$$

Therefore, (3.70) and (3.71) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} |m_{N1}(z) - m_{N2}(z)| &\geq C|1 - b(z)| \geq C\sqrt{\kappa + \eta}, & \eta > \eta_1 \\ &\leq C(\log N)\sqrt{\delta(z)}, & \eta \leq \eta_1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.72)$$

Observe that in $\Xi^c(z)$ we have

$$|m_0(z) - m_N(z)| \leq (\log N)^{-1}$$

Thus, when $\eta \sim 1$, it is obvious that

$$m_N(z) = m_{N1}(z) = m_0(z) + \frac{4\delta_0(z)}{a(z) \left((1 - b(z)) + \sqrt{(1 - b(z))^2 + 4a(z)\delta_0(z)} \right)}$$

and

$$|m_0(z) - m_N(z)| \leq C \frac{\delta(z)}{|1 - b(z)|} \leq C \frac{\delta(z)}{\sqrt{\kappa + \eta}}.$$

Now by (3.72) we know that $m_{N1}(z) \neq m_{N2}(z)$ when $\eta \geq \eta_1$. Therefore, for $\eta \geq \eta_1$, by continuity we have

$$m_N(z) = m_{N1}(z),$$

and

$$|m_0(z) - m_N(z)| \leq C \frac{\delta(z)}{|1 - b(z)|} \leq C \frac{\delta(z)}{|1 - b(z)| + \sqrt{\delta(z)}} \leq C \frac{\delta(z)}{\sqrt{\kappa + \eta + \delta(z)}}.$$

When $\eta \leq \eta_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |m_0(z) - m_N(z)| &\leq |m_0(z) - m_{N1}(z)| + |m_{N1}(z) - m_{N2}(z)| \\ &\leq C(\log N)\sqrt{\delta(z)} \leq C(\log N) \frac{\delta(z)}{\sqrt{\kappa + \eta + \delta(z)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we proved (3.51) when $\eta \in I_E$.

Then it remains to show that when $\mathbf{S}$ occurs, I_E is just exactly $[\varphi^L N^{-1}, 1]$. The proof is nearly the same as the counterpart in [30]. However, for the convenience of the reader, we reproduce it here. We assume $I_E \neq [\varphi^L N^{-1}, 1]$ to get a contradiction. Note that if $I_E \neq [\varphi^L N^{-1}, 1]$, we can set $\eta_0 = \inf I_E$ which satisfies

$$\Lambda_o(E + i\eta_0) + \Lambda_d(E + i\eta_0) = (\log N)^{-1}. \quad (3.73)$$

Then by the definition of $\Gamma(z, K)$, we see in $\mathbf{S}$ there exists

$$\Lambda_o(E + i\eta_0) + \max_i |G_{ii}(E + i\eta_0) - m_N(E + i\eta_0)|$$

$$\leq K\Psi(E + i\eta_0) \leq K\varphi^{-L/2} \leq (\log N)^{-2} \quad (3.74)$$

by the assumption of $\varphi^L \geq K^2(\log N)^4$. Moreover, since $\eta_0 \in I_E$, we also have

$$\Lambda(E + i\eta_0) \leq C(\log N)\sqrt{\delta(E + i\eta_0)} = O((\log N)^{-3}). \quad (3.75)$$

Thus (3.74) and (3.75) together imply that

$$\Lambda_o(E + i\eta_0) + \Lambda_d(E + i\eta_0) \leq O((\log N)^{-2}),$$

which contradicts to (3.73) when N is sufficiently large. Thus we complete the proof. $\square$

Now we can start to prove Theorem 3.3.

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Note that by the definitions of $\Omega(z, K)$ and $\Gamma(z, K)$, we have for any $\zeta > 0$, there exist a positive constants C_ζ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{D}(m_N(z))| &\leq |[Y]| + O(\max_i |G_{ii}(z) - m_N(z)|^2) + \infty \mathbf{1}_{\Xi(z)} \\ &\leq \varphi^{C_\zeta} \Psi(z) + \infty \mathbf{1}_{\Xi(z)}, \quad \forall z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta) \end{aligned}$$

holds on the event

$$\bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)} \Gamma(z, \varphi^{C_\zeta}).$$

Now set

$$\mathbf{S} = \bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)} \Gamma(z, \varphi^{C_\zeta}) \cap \bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta), \eta=1} \Xi^c(z).$$

and

$$\delta(z) = \varphi^{C_\zeta} (N\eta)^{-1/2}$$

in Lemma 3.13. We can get that

$$\Lambda(z) \leq \varphi^{C_\zeta} (N\eta)^{-1/4}, \quad \forall z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$$

hold in $\mathbf{S}$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.13 we know

$$\mathbf{S} \subset \bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)} \Xi^c(z). \quad (3.76)$$

Thus we have

$$\Lambda \leq \Lambda_d \leq (\log N)^{-1}, \quad \Psi(z) \leq C(N\eta)^{-1/2}, \quad \text{in } \mathbf{S}.$$

Moreover, by the definitions of $\mathbf{S}$, Lemma 3.8 and the fact that

$$\bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta), \eta=1} \Xi^c(z)$$

holds with ζ -high probability which is implied by Lemma 3.5 and 3.6, we see that $\mathbf{S}$ holds with ζ -high probability. Then by (3.76) and Lemma 3.8 we also know

$$\bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)} \Omega^c(z, \varphi^{C_\zeta})$$

holds with ζ -high probability. Therefore, by the definition of $\Omega(z, \varphi^{C_\zeta})$ we see that Theorem 3.3 follows. $\square$

3.2. Improved bound on $[Y]$. In order to prove Theorem 3.2, the main thing is to provide a stronger bound on $[Y]$. More precisely, we need stronger bounds on $[T]$ and $v_1(z)$. Here

$$[T] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i(z).$$

Similarly, we will denote

$$[U] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N U_i(z).$$

Recall the decomposition

$$Y_i = T_i + U_i + V = T_i + U_i + \sum_{k=1}^4 v_k,$$

which implies that

$$[Y] = [T] + [U] + \sum_{k=1}^4 v_k.$$

Note that by definitions, in $\Gamma(z, K) \cap \Xi^c(z)$, we have

$$|U_i|, |v_2|, |v_3|, |v_4| = O(K^2 \Psi^2).$$

Such a strong bound is enough for our purpose. Thus our main task in this subsection is to improve the bounds on $[T]$ and v_1 . Actually, we need to prove the following Lemma.

Lemma 3.14. *Let $K = \varphi^{O(1)}$ and $0 < L = O(1)$ satisfying $\varphi^L \geq K^2(\log N)^4$. Suppose that for some event*

$$\Theta \subset \bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L)} (\Gamma(z, K) \cap \Xi^c(z)),$$

we have

$$\Lambda(z) \leq \tilde{\Lambda}(z) \leq 1, \quad \forall z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L),$$

where $\tilde{\Lambda}(z)$ is some deterministic number. And we also have

$$\mathbb{P}(\Theta^c) \leq \exp(-p(\log N)^2)$$

for some

$$1 \ll p \ll \min\{\varphi^{L/2} K^{-1}(\log N)^{-1}, \frac{1}{2} K^{\tau-1}(\log N)^{-2}\}, \quad (3.77)$$

where τ is the parameter in Lemma 3.4. Then there exists an event $\Theta' \subset \Theta$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}((\Theta')^c) \leq \frac{1}{2} \exp(-p) \quad (3.78)$$

and for any $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L)$, we have

$$|[T]| + |v_1| \leq Cp^5 K^2 \left(\tilde{\Psi}^2 + \tilde{\Lambda} \tilde{\Psi} \right), \quad \tilde{\Psi} := \sqrt{\frac{\Im m_0 + \tilde{\Lambda}}{N\eta}}, \quad \text{in } \Theta', \quad (3.79)$$

which implies

$$|[Y]| \leq Cp^5 K^2 \left(\tilde{\Psi}^2 + \tilde{\Lambda} \tilde{\Psi} \right), \quad \text{in } \Theta'.$$

Remark 3.15. This lemma can be regarded as an extension of Lemma 7.1 of [30] to the non-null case. Moreover, it is also analogous to Lemma 5.2 of [20], Corollary 4.2 of [22] and Lemma 4.1 of [13] for Wigner matrices or the adjacency matrices of Erdős-Rényi graphs.

By definitions, we have

$$[T] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \mathbf{r}_i - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma \right),$$

and

$$v_1 = \hat{v}_1 + \check{v}_1$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{v}_1 &:= -m_N(z) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N v_{1i}(z) \\ \check{v}_1 &:= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (G_{ii}(z) - m_N(z)) v_{1i}(z). \end{aligned}$$

Here $v_{1i}(z)$ is defined in (3.9).

Observe that by definition we know in $\bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L)} (\Gamma(z, K) \cap \Xi^c(z))$, there exists the following bounds

$$|v_{1i}|, |G_{ii}(z) - m_N(z)| \leq K\Psi(z).$$

Thus in Θ there exists

$$|\check{v}_1| \leq CK^2 \tilde{\Psi}^2.$$

Note that in $\Xi^c(z)$, we also have

$$m_N(z) \sim 1.$$

Hence, it suffices to bound $[T]$ and

$$\omega := \omega(z) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N v_{1i}(z).$$

Note that both $[T]$ and ω are in the form of

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{x}_i^* A^{(i)} \mathbf{x}_i - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} A^{(i)}) \quad (3.80)$$

with some matrix $A^{(i)}$ independent of $\mathbf{x}_i$ but constructed from all the other $\mathbf{x}_j, j \neq i$. If we use the notation $\mathbb{E}_i$ to denote the expectation with respect to $\mathbf{x}_i$, we can also write

$$[T] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - \mathbb{E}_i) \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \mathbf{r}_i$$

and

$$\omega = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - \mathbb{E}_i) \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma (m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \mathbf{r}_i.$$

In the sequel, we will use the notation

$$Q_{\mathbb{A}} := \prod_{k \in \mathbb{A}} (1 - \mathbb{E}_k),$$

and $Q_{\{i\}} = 1 - \mathbb{E}_i$ will be simply denoted by Q_i . To bound summation in the form of (3.80), we will adopt the abstract decoupling lemma of [30] (see Lemma 7.3 therein), which is a large deviation lemma for weakly hierarchically coupled random variables. We cite it as the following lemma.

Lemma 3.16 (Lemma 7.3, [30]). *Let $Z_1, \dots, Z_N$ be random variables which are functions of $x_{ij}, 1 \leq i \leq M, 1 \leq j \leq N$. Let Θ be an event and p an even integer, which may depend on N . Suppose the following assumptions hold with some constant $C_1, c_1 > 0$.*

(i) *There exist some deterministic positive numbers $\mathcal{X} < 1$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ such that for any set $\mathbb{A} \subset \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ with $i \in \mathbb{A}$ and $|\mathbb{A}| \leq p$, $Q_{\mathbb{A}} Z_i$ in Θ can be written as the sum of two new random variables as*

$$\mathbf{1}(\Theta)(Q_{\mathbb{A}} Z_i) = Z_{i, \mathbb{A}} + \mathbf{1}(\Theta) Q_{\mathbb{A}} \mathbf{1}(\Theta^c) \tilde{Z}_{i, \mathbb{A}}$$

and

$$|Z_{i, \mathbb{A}}| \leq \mathcal{Y}(C_1 \mathcal{X}^{|\mathbb{A}|})^{|\mathbb{A}|}, \quad |\tilde{Z}_{i, \mathbb{A}}| \leq \mathcal{Y} N^{C_1 |\mathbb{A}|}.$$

Here $\mathbf{1}(\Theta)$ represents the indicator function of Θ . (ii) For Z_i , we have the rough definite bound

$$\max_i |Z_i| \leq \mathcal{Y} N^{C_1}.$$

(iii) For Θ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\Theta^c) \leq \exp(-c_1 (\log N)^{3/2} p).$$

Then, under the assumptions (i), (ii) and (iii) we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N Q_i Z_i \right)^p \leq (Cp)^{4p} [\mathcal{X}^2 + N^{-1}]^p \mathcal{Y}^p \quad (3.81)$$

for some $C > 0$ and any sufficiently large N .

Remark 3.17. We remind here similar results also appeared in some previous works, such as Theorem 5.6 of [13] and Lemma 4.1 of [22].

Remark 3.18. Note that once we have (3.81), we can use Markov inequality to get

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N Q_i Z_i \right| \geq C \mathcal{Y} p^5 [\mathcal{X}^2 + N^{-1}] \right) \ll \frac{1}{2} \exp(-p).$$

With the aid of Lemma 3.16, we now come to prove Lemma 3.14.

Proof of Lemma 3.14. Note that it suffices to find an event $\Theta' \in \Theta$ satisfying (3.78) such that

$$|[T]| \leq Cp^5 K^2 \tilde{\Psi}^2 \quad (3.82)$$

and

$$|\omega| \leq Cp^5 K^2 (\tilde{\Psi}^2 + \tilde{\Lambda} \tilde{\Psi})$$

in Θ' . To simplify the discussion on ω we introduce the quantities

$$\tilde{\nu}_i : = \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma (m_0(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \mathbf{r}_i$$

$$\tilde{v}_{1i} : = Q_i \tilde{\nu}_i = \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma (m_0(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \mathbf{r}_i - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(m_0(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma$$

and

$$\tilde{\omega} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{v}_{1i}.$$

It suffices to show that in Θ' , there exist (3.82) and

$$|\omega - \tilde{\omega}| \leq C (K \tilde{\Lambda} \tilde{\Psi} + K^2 \tilde{\Psi}^2), \quad (3.83)$$

$$|\tilde{\omega}| \leq Cp^5 K^2 \tilde{\Psi}^2. \quad (3.84)$$

At first, we come to show (3.83). Note that by definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |v_{1i} - \tilde{v}_{1i}| &= \left| Q_i \left(\mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma \left[(m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} - (m_0(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \right] \mathbf{r}_i \right) \right| \\ &= |m_N^{(i)}(z) - m_0(z)| \left| Q_i \left(\mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma (m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma (m_0(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \mathbf{r}_i \right) \right| \\ &\leq CK(\Lambda + \Lambda_o^2) \Psi \leq C(K\Lambda\Psi + K^3\Psi^3) \leq C(K\Lambda\Psi + K^2\Psi^2). \end{aligned}$$

Here in the first inequality above we have used the fact that $|m_N^{(i)}(z) - m_0(z)| \leq \Lambda + C\Lambda_o^2$ and in the last step we have used the fact that $K\Psi \ll 1$ which is implied by the assumption on K and L immediately. Note here we have used the fact that in $\Gamma(z, K) \cap \Xi^c(z)$, there exists

$$|R_i| = |Q_i \left(\mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma (m_N^{(i)}(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \Sigma (m_0(z) \Sigma + I)^{-1} \mathbf{r}_i \right)| \leq K\Psi(z).$$

Thus it remains to show (3.82) and (3.84). We will adopt Lemma 3.16 to prove both of these two inequalities.

We remind here that we learn the proof strategy which will be used below from [13].

At first, we come to deal with the simpler one (3.82). Note that

$$z + z \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \mathbf{r}_i = -(G_{ii}(z))^{-1}.$$

Thus

$$T_i = Q_i(zG_{ii}(z))^{-1}.$$

Since $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L)$, it suffices to bound

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Q_i(G_{ii}(z))^{-1}.$$

Now we can set $Z_i = (G_{ii}(z))^{-1}$ in Lemma 3.16. Then by Lemma 3.16 and Markov inequality it suffices to show that for $i \in \mathbb{A} \subset \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ and $|\mathbb{A}| \leq p$ there exists $Z_{i,\mathbb{A}}$ and $\tilde{Z}_{i,\mathbb{A}}$ satisfying

$$\mathbf{1}(\Theta)(Q_{\mathbb{A}}Z_i) = Z_{i,\mathbb{A}} + \mathbf{1}(\Theta)Q_{\mathbb{A}}\mathbf{1}(\Theta^c)\tilde{Z}_{i,\mathbb{A}}, \quad Z_{i,\mathbb{A}} \leq \mathcal{Y}(C\mathcal{X}|\mathbb{A}|)^{|\mathbb{A}|}, \quad \tilde{Z}_{i,\mathbb{A}} \leq \mathcal{Y}N^{C|\mathbb{A}|} \quad (3.85)$$

with

$$\mathcal{X} = K\tilde{\Psi}, \quad \mathcal{Y} = C \quad (3.86)$$

for some positive constant C . The proof of (3.85) is totally the same as the counterpart in the null case, see the proof of Lemma 7.4 and Lemma 7.1 of [30]. The proof only depends on the equations listed in Lemma 3.1 thus is also valid for our non-null case. So here we omit the details. Our main target is to prove (3.84) in the sequel.

By Lemma 3.16, it suffices to show that there exists an event Θ with probability

$$\mathbb{P}(\Theta) \geq 1 - \exp(-(\log N)^{3/2}p)$$

such that for $i \in \mathbb{A} \subset \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ and $|\mathbb{A}| \leq p$ there exists $\tilde{\nu}_{i,\mathbb{A}}$ and $\hat{\nu}_{i,\mathbb{A}}$ satisfying

$$\mathbf{1}(\Theta)(Q_{\mathbb{A}}\tilde{\nu}_i) = \tilde{\nu}_{i,\mathbb{A}} + \mathbf{1}(\Theta)Q_{\mathbb{A}}\mathbf{1}(\Theta^c)\hat{\nu}_{i,\mathbb{A}}, \quad \tilde{\nu}_{i,\mathbb{A}} \leq \mathcal{Y}(C\mathcal{X}|\mathbb{A}|)^{|\mathbb{A}|}, \quad \hat{\nu}_{i,\mathbb{A}} \leq \mathcal{Y}N^{C|\mathbb{A}|} \quad (3.87)$$

for some constant $C > 0$, where $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are specified to be those in (3.86).

Note that by the fact $\eta \gg N^{-1}$ in $S_r(\tilde{c}, L)$ and the truncation on x_{ij} , we see (3.87) holds naturally when $\mathbb{A} = \{i\}$. Thus we can always assume $|\mathbb{A}| \geq 2$ in the sequel. Now let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{W})$ be a function of $\mathcal{W}$ and denote $\mathcal{A}^{(\mathbb{T})} = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{W}^{(\mathbb{T})})$. Pursuing the idea in [13], we define

$$\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{S},\mathbb{U}} := \sum_{\mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbb{U} \subset \mathbb{V} \subset \mathbb{S}} (-1)^{|\mathbb{V}|} \mathcal{A}^{(\mathbb{V})},$$

for any $\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{U} \subset \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. Then by definition it is not difficult to see for any $\mathbb{S} \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$, there exists

$$\mathcal{A} = \sum_{\emptyset \subset \mathbb{U} \subset \mathbb{S}} \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{S},\mathbb{U}}.$$

Moreover, it is not difficult to see $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{S},\mathbb{U}}$ is independent of the k -th column of X if $k \in \mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbb{U}$. Thus we have

$$Q_{\mathbb{S}}\mathcal{A} = Q_{\mathbb{S}} \sum_{\emptyset \subset \mathbb{U} \subset \mathbb{S}} \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{S},\mathbb{U}} = Q_{\mathbb{S}}\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{S},\mathbb{S}},$$

which implies that

$$Q_{\mathbb{A}} \tilde{\nu}_i = Q_i Q_{\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}} \tilde{\nu}_i = Q_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\nu}_i)^{\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}, \mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}}.$$

Now we set

$$\tilde{\nu}_{i,\mathbb{A}} := \mathbf{1}(\Theta) Q_{\mathbb{A}} \mathbf{1}(\Theta)(\tilde{\nu})^{\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}, \mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}}, \quad \hat{\nu}_{i,\mathbb{A}} := (\tilde{\nu})^{\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}, \mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}}.$$

It is easy to get the bound of $\hat{\nu}_{i,\mathbb{A}}$ in (3.87), thus we only need to handle $\tilde{\nu}_{i,\mathbb{A}}$ below. That is to say, we shall show that for $2 \leq |\mathbb{A}| \leq p$, there exists

$$\left| \mathbf{1}(\Theta)(\tilde{\nu})^{\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}, \mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}} \right| \leq \mathcal{Y}(C\mathcal{X}|\mathbb{A}|)^{|\mathbb{A}|}, \quad \mathcal{X} = K\tilde{\Psi}, \quad \mathcal{Y} = C. \quad (3.88)$$

Now we need the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3.19. *Let p be an even number satisfying*

$$1 \ll p \ll \varphi^{L/2} K^{-1} (\log N)^{-1},$$

then in $\bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L)} (\Gamma(z, K) \cap \Xi^c(z))$, for any $\mathbb{T}$ with $|\mathbb{T}| \leq p$, there exists

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{i,j \notin \mathbb{T}} |G_{ij}^{(\mathbb{T})}| &\leq C \max_{i,j} |G_{ij}|, \quad \min_{i \notin \mathbb{T}} |G_{ii}^{(\mathbb{T})}| \geq c \min_i |G_{ii}|, \\ \frac{1}{N} \Im Tr \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{T})} &\leq \frac{1}{N} \Im Tr \mathcal{G} + Cp(K^2 \Psi^2 + \frac{1}{N}) \end{aligned}$$

with some positive constants C, c .

For ease of presentation, we denote

$$M_0 := M_0(z) = (m_0(z)\Sigma + I)^{-1}.$$

And now we set the event

$$\Upsilon(z) := \bigcap_{i \neq j} \left\{ \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{T} \cup \{i,j\})}(z) \Sigma M_0(z) \mathbf{r}_j^* \leq K \Psi(z) \text{ for all } \mathbb{T} \in \{1, \dots, N\}, i, j \notin \mathbb{T}, |\mathbb{T}| \leq p \right\}.$$

Then we have the following lemma

Lemma 3.20. *Let p be an even number satisfying*

$$1 \ll p \ll \min\left\{ \frac{1}{2} K^{\tau-1} (\log N)^{-2}, \varphi^{L/2} K^{-1} (\log N)^{-1} \right\}.$$

Then in $\bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L)} (\Gamma(z, K) \cap \Xi^c(z))$, we have $\bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L)} \Upsilon(z)$ holds with probability larger than

$$1 - \exp(-CK^{\tau-1})$$

with some positive constant C .

In the sequel, we will assume

$$\Theta \subset \bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L)} (\Gamma(z, K) \cap \Xi^c(z) \cap \Upsilon(z)).$$

Now we prove (3.88) assuming Lemma 3.19 and 3.20 at first and postpone the proofs of these two lemmas after that. As a warm up, we start with the case of $|\mathbb{A}| = 2$ and $|\mathbb{A}| = 3$.

Let $\mathbb{A} = \{i, j\}$ with some $j \neq i$. Note

$$(\tilde{\nu})^{\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}, \mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}} = \tilde{\nu}^{\{j\}, \{j\}} = \tilde{\nu} - \tilde{\nu}^{(j)}.$$

Note that for any set $\mathbb{T}$ we have the relation

$$\mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{T} \cup \{i, j\})} \mathbf{r}_j = z^{-1} \frac{G_{ij}^{(\mathbb{T})}}{G_{ii}^{(\mathbb{T})} G_{jj}^{(\mathbb{T} \cup \{i\})}}, \quad \text{for } i, j \notin \mathbb{T}.$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\nu}_i)^{\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}, \mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}} &= \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(ij)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i \\ &= -\mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \mathbf{r}_j \mathbf{r}_j^* \mathcal{G}^{(ij)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i \\ &= -\frac{1}{1 + \mathbf{r}_j^* \mathcal{G}^{(ij)} \mathbf{r}_j} \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(ij)} \mathbf{r}_j \mathbf{r}_j^* \mathcal{G}^{(ij)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i \\ &= z G_{jj}^{(i)} \mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(ij)} \mathbf{r}_j \mathbf{r}_j^* \mathcal{G}^{(ij)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i \\ &= G_{ij} (G_{ii})^{-1} \mathbf{r}_j^* \mathcal{G}^{(ij)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i \\ &\leq O(\mathcal{X}^2) \quad \text{in } \Theta. \end{aligned} \tag{3.89}$$

If $|\mathbb{A}| = 3$, without loss of generality, we assume that $\mathbb{A} = \{i, j, k\}$, it is easy to see

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\nu}_i)^{\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}, \mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}} &= G_{ij} (G_{ii})^{-1} \mathbf{r}_j^* \mathcal{G}^{(ij)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i - G_{ij}^{(k)} (G_{ii}^{(k)})^{-1} \mathbf{r}_j^* \mathcal{G}^{(ijk)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i \\ &= (G_{ij} - G_{ij}^{(k)}) (G_{ii})^{-1} \mathbf{r}_j^* \mathcal{G}^{(ij)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i \\ &\quad + G_{ij}^{(k)} ((G_{ii})^{-1} - (G_{ii}^{(k)})^{-1}) \mathbf{r}_j^* \mathcal{G}^{(ij)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i \\ &\quad + G_{ij}^{(k)} (G_{ii}^{(k)})^{-1} (\mathbf{r}_j^* \mathcal{G}^{(ij)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j^* \mathcal{G}^{(ijk)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i). \end{aligned} \tag{3.90}$$

Note that for any set $\mathbb{T}$ such that $i, j, k \notin \mathbb{T}$, there exist

$$\begin{aligned} G_{ij}^{(\mathbb{T})} - G_{ij}^{(\mathbb{T} \cup \{k\})} &= G_{ik}^{(\mathbb{T})} (G_{kk}^{(\mathbb{T})})^{-1} G_{kj}^{(\mathbb{T})}, \\ (G_{ii}^{(\mathbb{T})})^{-1} - (G_{ii}^{(\mathbb{T} \cup \{k\})})^{-1} &= -(G_{ii}^{(\mathbb{T})})^{-1} G_{ik}^{(\mathbb{T})} (G_{kk}^{(\mathbb{T})})^{-1} G_{ki}^{(\mathbb{T})} (G_{ii}^{(\mathbb{T} \cup \{k\})})^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{3.91}$$

and

$$\mathbf{r}_j^* \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{T} \cup \{i, j\})} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j^* \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{T} \cup \{i, j, k\})} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i = G_{jk}^{(\mathbb{T} \cup \{i\})} (G_{jj}^{(\mathbb{T} \cup \{i\})})^{-1} \mathbf{r}_k^* \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{T} \cup \{i, j, k\})} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i. \tag{3.92}$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\nu}_i)^{\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}, \mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}} &= \mathbf{r}_j^* \mathcal{G}^{(ij)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i (G_{ii})^{-1} G_{ik} (G_{kk})^{-1} G_{kj} \\ &\quad - \mathbf{r}_j^* \mathcal{G}^{(ij)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i (G_{ii})^{-1} G_{ik} (G_{kk})^{-1} G_{ki} (G_{ii}^{(k)})^{-1} G_{ij}^{(k)} \\ &\quad + \mathbf{r}_k^* \mathcal{G}^{(ijk)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_i (G_{ii}^{(k)})^{-1} G_{ij}^{(k)} (G_{jj}^{(i)})^{-1} G_{jk}^{(i)} \\ &\leq O(\mathcal{X}^3), \quad \text{in } \Theta. \end{aligned}$$

Now we use the idea in [13] (see Section 5.2 therein) to introduce a class of rational functions in resolvent matrix elements. For fixed positive integer n we define

- (i) a sequence of integers $(i_r)_{r=1}^{n+1}$ satisfying $i_k \neq i_{k+1}$ for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ while $i_1 = i_{n+1}$;
- (ii) a collection of sets $(\mathbb{U}_\alpha)_{\alpha=1}^n$ satisfying $i_1, i_2 \in \mathbb{U}_1$ and $i_\alpha, i_{\alpha+1} \notin \mathbb{U}_\alpha, \alpha \geq 2$, and $\emptyset \subset \mathbb{U}_\alpha \subset \mathbb{A}$ for all $1 \leq \alpha \leq n$;
- (iii) a collection of sets $(\mathbb{T}_\beta)_{\beta=2}^n$ satisfying $i_\beta \notin \mathbb{T}_\beta$, and $\emptyset \subset \mathbb{T}_\beta \subset \mathbb{A}$ for all $2 \leq \beta \leq n$.

Then we define the random rational function

$$D((i_r)_{r=1}^{n+1}, (\mathbb{U}_\alpha)_{\alpha=1}^n, (\mathbb{T}_\beta)_{\beta=2}^n) := \frac{P}{Q}, \quad (3.93)$$

where

$$P = \mathbf{r}_{i_1}^* \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{U}_1)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_{i_2} \prod_{\alpha=2}^n G_{i_\alpha, i_{\alpha+1}}^{(\mathbb{U}_\alpha)}, \quad Q = \prod_{\beta=2}^n G_{i_\beta, i_\beta}^{(\mathbb{T}_\beta)}.$$

Note that in the cases of $|A| = 2$ and $|A| = 3$, we can write $(\tilde{\nu}_i)^{\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}, \mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}}$ as a summation of rational functions in the form of

$$\pm D((i_r)_{r=1}^{n+1}, (\mathbb{U}_\alpha)_{\alpha=1}^n, (\mathbb{T}_\beta)_{\beta=2}^n). \quad (3.94)$$

Actually, for general $\mathbb{S}$ we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.21. *Let $\mathbb{S} \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $i \notin \mathbb{S}$, then we have*

$$(\tilde{\nu}_i)^{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}} = \sum_{n=|\mathbb{S}|+1}^{2|\mathbb{S}|} D_n, \quad D_n = \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} D_{n,k},$$

where

$$\sum_{n=|\mathbb{S}|+1}^{2\mathbb{S}} K_n \leq 4^{|\mathbb{S}|} |\mathbb{S}|!,$$

and each $D_{n,k}$ is in the form of (3.94), with appropriate chosen sets $(\mathbb{U}_\alpha)_{\alpha=1}^n$ and $(\mathbb{T}_\beta)_{\beta=2}^n$ which may be different for each $F_{n,k}$.

Proof. Set

$$\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{S} \cup \{i\}.$$

We prove it by induction. Note that we already proved the cases of $|\mathbb{A}| = 2, 3$. At first, it is not difficult to check the following relation,

$$(\tilde{\nu}_i)^{\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}, \mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}} = (\tilde{\nu}_i)^{\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}, \mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}} - \left((\tilde{\nu}_i)^{\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}, \mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}} \right)^{(j)}$$

for any $j \neq i$ while $j \in A$. Now we assume that $(\tilde{\nu}_i)^{\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}, \mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}}$ can be written in the form of

$$(\tilde{\nu}_i)^{\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}, \mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}} = \sum_{n=|\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}|+1}^{2|\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}|} D_n, \quad D_n = \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} D_{n,k}$$

with some $D_{n,k}$ in the form of (3.94) and K_n satisfying

$$\sum_{n=|\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}|+1}^{2|\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}|} K_n \leq 4^{|\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}|} |\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}|!.$$

Then

$$(\tilde{\nu}_i)^{\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}, \mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}} = \sum_{n=|\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}|+1}^{2|\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}|} (D_n - D_n^{(j)}) = \sum_{n=|\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}|+1}^{2|\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}|} \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} (D_{n,k} - D_{n,k}^{(j)}).$$

Now we assume that there are $(i_r)_{r=1}^{n+1}, (\mathbb{U}_\alpha)_{\alpha=1}^n, (\mathbb{T}_\beta)_{\beta=2}^n$ such that

$$D_{n,k} = \mathbf{r}_{i_1}^* \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{U}_1)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_{i_2} \prod_{\alpha=2}^n G_{i_\alpha, i_{\alpha+1}}^{(\mathbb{U}_\alpha)} \prod_{\beta=2}^n \left(G_{i_\beta, i_\beta}^{(\mathbb{T}_\beta)} \right)^{-1}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} D_{n,k} - D_{n,k}^{(j)} &= \mathbf{r}_{i_1}^* \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{U}_1)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_{i_2} \prod_{\alpha=2}^n G_{i_\alpha, i_{\alpha+1}}^{(\mathbb{U}_\alpha)} \prod_{\beta=2}^n \left(G_{i_\beta, i_\beta}^{(\mathbb{T}_\beta)} \right)^{-1} \\ &\quad - \mathbf{r}_{i_1}^* \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{U}_1 \cup \{j\})} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_{i_2} \prod_{\alpha=2}^n G_{i_\alpha, i_{\alpha+1}}^{(\mathbb{U}_\alpha \cup \{j\})} \prod_{\beta=2}^n \left(G_{i_\beta, i_\beta}^{(\mathbb{T}_\beta \cup \{j\})} \right)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

Now obviously $D_{n,k} - D_{n,k}^{(j)}$ can be written as a summation of $(2n-1)$ terms, and every term contains one and only one factor in one of the following form

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{r}_{i_1}^* \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{U}_1)} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_{i_2} - \mathbf{r}_{i_1}^* \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{U}_1 \cup \{j\})} \Sigma M_0 \mathbf{r}_{i_2}, \\ &G_{i_\alpha, i_{\alpha+1}}^{(\mathbb{U}_\alpha)} - G_{i_\alpha, i_{\alpha+1}}^{(\mathbb{U}_\alpha \cup \{j\})}, \quad \left(G_{i_\beta, i_\beta}^{(\mathbb{T}_\beta)} \right)^{-1} - \left(G_{i_\beta, i_\beta}^{(\mathbb{T}_\beta \cup \{j\})} \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Now using (3.90) and (3.91) we see that $D_{n,k} - D_{n,k}^{(j)}$ is a summation of terms in the form of (3.93) with n replaced by $n+1$ or $n+2$. Moreover, the total number of these terms in $D_{n,k} - D_{n,k}^{(j)}$ is no more than $2n-1$. These facts together imply that we can write

$$(\tilde{\nu}_i)^{\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}, \mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}} = \sum_{n=|\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}|+1}^{2|\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}|} \sum_{k=1}^{K'_n} D'_{n,k}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{n=|\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}|+1}^{2|\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}|} \sum_{k=1}^{K'_n} \right| &\leq \left| \sum_{n=|\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}|+1}^{2|\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}|} K_n (2n-1) \right| \\ &\leq 4^{|\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}|+1} |\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}|! |\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i,j\}| \\ &\leq 4^{|\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}|} |\mathbb{A} \setminus \{i\}|! \end{aligned}$$

Thus we can complete the proof by induction. $\square$

Now by the definition of D_n , Lemma 3.19 and 3.20 we can find an event

$$\Theta \subset \bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L)} (\Gamma(z, K) \cap \Xi^c(z) \cap \Upsilon(z))$$

with probability

$$\mathbb{P}(\Theta) \geq 1 - \exp(-p(\log N)^{3/2})$$

such that (3.88) holds, thus we conclude the proof of Lemma 3.14. $\square$

Now we come to prove Lemma 3.19 and 3.20.

Proof of Lemma 3.19. Note that by (iii) of Lemma 3.1, we have

$$(G_{ii})^{-1} = (G_{ii}^{(j)})^{-1} - \frac{G_{ij}G_{ji}}{G_{ii}G_{jj}G_{ii}^{(j)}} = (1 + O(\mathcal{X}^2))(G_{ii}^{(j)})^{-1}$$

and

$$|G_{ij}^{(k)}| \leq \left| G_{ij} - \frac{G_{ik}G_{kj}}{G_{kk}} \right| \leq \Lambda_o(1 + O(\mathcal{X})), \quad i \neq j,$$

which implies

$$\min_{i \neq k} |G_{ii}^{(k)}| \geq (1 - O(\mathcal{X})) \min |G_{ii}|, \quad \max_{i, j \neq k} |G_{ij}^{(k)}| \leq (1 + O(\mathcal{X})) \max_{i, j} |G_{ij}|. \quad (3.95)$$

Thus we can get the first two inequalities of Lemma 3.19 by induction and the assumption that $p\mathcal{X} \ll 1$.

Now we come to show the third inequality of Lemma 3.19. Note that for $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 0)$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{N} \Im \text{Tr} \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{T})} - \frac{1}{N} \Im \text{Tr} \mathcal{G} \right| &\leq \left| \frac{1}{N} \Im \text{Tr} G^{(\mathbb{T})} - \frac{1}{N} \Im \text{Tr} G \right| + O\left(\frac{p\eta}{N}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \notin \mathbb{T}} |G_{ii}^{(\mathbb{T})} - G_{ii}| + O\left(\frac{p}{N}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now by (3.95) and (iii) of Lemma 3.1, it is not difficult to see that

$$|G_{ii}^{(\mathbb{T})} - G_{ii}| \leq pK^2\Psi^2.$$

Therefore, we conclude the proof. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 3.20. Similarly, it suffices to prove the result for any fixed $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, L)$. By using Lemma 3.4 and (iv) of Lemma 2.3 we have that

$$\mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{T} \cup \{i, j\})}(z) \Sigma M_0(z) \mathbf{r}_j^* \leq K \frac{1}{N} \|\mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{T} \cup \{i, j\})}(z)\|_{HS} = K \sqrt{\frac{\Im \text{Tr} \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{T} \cup \{i, j\})}(z)}{N^2 \eta}}$$

holds with probability larger than

$$1 - N^C \exp(-C' K^{\tau^{-1}})$$

with some positive constants C, C' . Now by Lemma 3.19 and the assumption on p one has

$$\mathbf{r}_i^* \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbb{T} \cup \{i,j\})}(z) \Sigma M_0(z) \mathbf{r}_j^* \leq K \sqrt{\frac{\Im \text{Tr} \mathcal{G}(z)}{N^2 \eta}} + \Psi^2(z) \leq CK \Psi(z), \quad \text{in } \Gamma(z, K) \cap \Xi^c(z).$$

Now note

$$\#\{\mathbb{T} \subset \{1, \dots, N\} : |\mathbb{T}| \leq p\} = O(N^{p+1}).$$

Thus in $\Gamma(z, K) \cap \Xi^c(z)$, Υ holds with probability larger than

$$1 - O(N^{p+C} \exp(-C' K^{\tau-1})) \geq 1 - \exp(-\frac{C'}{2} K^{\tau-1})$$

by the assumption on p . Thus we conclude the proof. $\square$

3.3. Strong local MP-type law around λ_r . Now we come to prove Theorem 3.2. The proof is rely on a bootstrap strategy we have mentioned in Introduction and is similar to that of the null case in [30]. The main difference is that the iterate rate in the bootstrap process for our non-null case is slower than that of the null case in [30]. Roughly speaking, we will show that if for some exponent τ , $\Lambda(z) \leq (N\eta)^{-\tau}$ holds module some logarithmic factors with high probability, there also exists $\Lambda(z) \leq (N\eta)^{\frac{-(1+3\tau)}{4}}$ module some logarithmic factors with high probability.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. We assume $\zeta \geq 1$. By Theorem 3.3, Lemma 3.8 and Lemma 3.20, we know that for any $\zeta > 0$, there exists a positive constant C_ζ such that

$$\Theta_1 \subset \bigcap_{z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 10C_\zeta)} (\Gamma(z, \varphi^{C_\zeta}) \cap \Xi^c(z) \cap \Upsilon(z))$$

holds with $(\zeta + 2(\log 1.3)^{-1})$ -high probability. In the sequel, we assume

$$C_\zeta \geq \tau(10\zeta + 20(\log 1.3)^{-1}), \quad (3.96)$$

where $\tau \geq 1$ is the parameter in Lemma 3.4. By Lemma 3.12 we know

$$|\mathcal{D}(m_N)(z)| \leq C\varphi^{2C_\zeta} \Psi^2 + |[Y]|, \quad \text{in } \Theta_1.$$

Now let $\Lambda_1 = 1$, thus $\Lambda \leq \Lambda_1$ in Θ_1 . Set

$$p = p_1 = -\log(1 - \mathbb{P}(\Theta_1))/(\log N)^2$$

in Lemma 3.14. Thus we have

$$p_1 = C\varphi^{\zeta+2(\log 1.3)^{-1}}/(\log N)^2.$$

Recall the parameters K, L used in Lemma 3.14, here we have $L = 10C_\zeta$, $K = \varphi^{C_\zeta}$. Thus it is easy to check (3.77) by (3.96).

By Lemma 3.14, we know for $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 10C_\zeta)$ there exists an event Θ_2 such that

$$\Theta_2 \subset \Theta_1, \quad \mathbb{P}(\Theta_2) = 1 - \exp(-p_1)$$

and

$$|[Y]| \leq \varphi^{2C_\zeta+5\zeta+10(\log 1.3)^{-1}}(\Psi_1^2 + \Lambda_1\Psi_1), \quad \Psi_1 := \sqrt{\frac{\Im m_0 + \Lambda_1}{N\eta}}, \quad \text{in } \Theta_2.$$

Then in Θ_2 , we have

$$|\mathcal{D}(m_N)(z)| \leq \varphi^{2C_\zeta+5\zeta+10(\log 1.3)^{-1}}(\Psi_1^2 + \Lambda_1\Psi_1). \quad (3.97)$$

Note that the r.h.s. of (3.97) is decreasing in η and by (3.96) it is less than $(\log N)^{-8}$. Then by using Lemma 3.13 we have

$$\Lambda(z) \leq \Lambda_2(z) := \varphi^{2C_\zeta+6\zeta+10(\log 1.3)^{-1}} \left(\frac{\Psi_1^2}{\sqrt{\kappa + \eta + \Psi_1^2}} + \frac{\Lambda_1\Psi_1}{\sqrt{\kappa + \eta + \Lambda_1\Psi_1}} \right). \quad (3.98)$$

Now note by using the fact that

$$\Im m_0(z) \leq O(\sqrt{\kappa + \eta}), \quad \text{in } S_r(\tilde{c}, 10C_\zeta)$$

one can easily get that

$$\frac{\Psi_1^2}{\sqrt{\kappa + \eta + \Psi_1^2}} \leq C\Lambda_1^{1/2}(N\eta)^{-1/2}. \quad (3.99)$$

Moreover, in Θ_2 we have

$$\frac{\Lambda_1\Psi_1}{\sqrt{\kappa + \eta + \Lambda_1\Psi_1}} \leq \Lambda_1 \cdot \frac{\Psi_1}{(\kappa + \eta + \Lambda_1\Psi_1)^{1/4}} \cdot \frac{1}{(\Lambda_1\Psi_1)^{1/4}}. \quad (3.100)$$

Now note that we have

$$\frac{1}{(\Lambda_1\Psi_1)^{1/4}} \leq \frac{1}{(\Lambda_1\sqrt{\frac{\Lambda_1}{N\eta}})^{1/4}}, \quad (3.101)$$

and

$$\frac{\Psi_1^2}{(\kappa + \eta + \Lambda_1\Psi_1)^{1/2}} \leq \frac{\Im m_0(z)/(N\eta)}{\sqrt{\kappa + \eta}} + \frac{\Lambda_1/(N\eta)}{(\Lambda_1\sqrt{\frac{\Lambda_1}{N\eta}})^{1/2}} \leq C \left((N\eta)^{-1} + \Lambda_1^{1/4}(N\eta)^{-3/4} \right). \quad (3.102)$$

Inserting (3.101) and (3.102) into (3.100) we have

$$\frac{\Lambda_1\Psi_1}{\sqrt{\kappa + \eta + \Lambda_1\Psi_1}} \leq C \left(\Lambda_1^{5/8}(N\eta)^{-3/8} + \Lambda_1^{3/4}(N\eta)^{-1/4} \right). \quad (3.103)$$

Combining (3.99) and (3.103) we have for $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 10C_\zeta)$, there exists

$$\Lambda \leq \Lambda_2 \leq \varphi^{2C_\zeta+6\zeta+10(\log 1.3)^{-1}} \left(\Lambda_1^{3/4}(N\eta)^{-1/4} \right) \ll 1.$$

Then iterate this process for $K_0 := \log \log N / \log 1.3$ times, we have

$$\Theta_{K_0} \subset \Theta_{K_0-1}, \quad \mathbb{P}(\Theta_{K_0}) = 1 - \exp(-p_{K_0})$$

with

$$p_{K_0} = -\log[1 - \mathbb{P}(\Theta_{K_0-1})]/(\log N)^2 = C\varphi^{\zeta+2(\log 1.3)^{-1}}(\log N)^{-2K_0} \geq \varphi^\zeta$$

and in Θ_{K_0} one has

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda(z) \leq \Lambda_{K_0}(z) &:= \varphi^{2C_\zeta+6\zeta+10(\log 1.3)^{-1}} \Lambda_{K_0-1}^{3/4}(N\eta)^{-1/4} \\ &\leq \varphi^{2C_\zeta+6\zeta+10(\log 1.3)^{-1}} (N\eta)^{-1+(3/4)^{K_0}} \\ &\leq \varphi^{2C_\zeta+6\zeta+10(\log 1.3)^{-1}+1} (N\eta)^{-1},\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used the fact

$$N^{(3/4)^{K_0}} \leq \varphi$$

which can easily be verified by the definition of K_0 . Thus we complete the proof of (3.10) by adjusting the constant C_ζ in Theorem 3.2. Moreover, by $\Theta_{K_0} \subset \Theta_1$ and the definition of Θ_1 we obtain (3.11). $\square$

4. UNIVERSALITY FOR THE LARGEST EIGENVALUE

In this section, we will prove the universality for the largest eigenvalue. Actually, with the aid of the local MP type law, the proof of the edge universality can be obtained through a routine discussion as that in the null case. The proof process is analogous to that of [30]. As we have sketched in Introduction, the Green function comparison strategy was developed in the series works [20, 21, 22, 14] for generalized Wigner matrices and Erdős-Rényi graph, and extended to sample covariance matrices in the null case in [30]. One main novelty in [30] is that the authors replace once a column instead of once an entry in the swapping process. Such an idea allows one to extend the Green function comparison approach to prove the edge universality even for some random matrix model with weakly dependent column entries such as the correlation matrices. One can refer to [7] and [31]. In our non-null case, we will also adopt this idea. To this end, at first we need to translate the information on $m_N(z)$ to the eigenvalues around λ_r . More precisely, we will prove the rigidity of the locations of the eigenvalues on the right edge. Then rely on the rigidity of the eigenvalues, we can pursue a Green function comparison strategy to prove the edge universality.

One main difficulty in this part is that we need to provide some bounds for the entries of $\Sigma^{1/2}\mathcal{G}\Sigma^{1/2}$ and $\Sigma^{1/2}\mathcal{G}^2\Sigma^{1/2}$ (see Lemma 4.8 below), which is a necessary input for the Green function comparison process. When Σ is diagonal, these desired bounds can be obtained through a delocalization result on the eigenvectors of $\mathcal{W}_N$. However, for more general Σ , the issue will be much more complicated. In more general case, we turn to seek for a rough bound on $\Im(\Sigma^{1/2}\mathcal{G}\Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}, k = 1, \dots, M$. It will be seen that such a rough bound is enough for the Green function comparison strategy assuming the two matrices are matching to order 4. Thus the main novelties in this part are one delocalization estimate for the eigenvectors of $\mathcal{W}_N$ in the edge case for diagonal Σ and a rough bound on $\Im(\Sigma^{1/2}\mathcal{G}\Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}, k = 1, \dots, M$ for general Σ . Especially, for the later one, our main idea is to provide a rough bound for the diagonal entries of $\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathcal{W} - z_0)^{-1}\Sigma^{1/2}$ with $z_0 = E + i\eta_0$, where $\eta_0 = N^{-2/3+\varepsilon} \gg \eta$. Then by this rough bound we can obtain a rough bound on $(\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{u}_i\mathbf{u}_i^*\Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}, k = 1, \dots, M$, where $\mathbf{u}_i$ is the unit eigenvector of $\mathcal{W}$ corresponding to λ_i which is around

λ_r . Then the bounds for $(\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{u}_i\mathbf{u}_i^*\Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}$ can turn to help us to provide a rough bound on $\Im(\Sigma^{1/2}\mathcal{G}\Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}$.

Now we start to expand the strategy summarized above in details. At first, we need the following rigidity result on the right edge.

Theorem 4.1 (Rigidity of the eigenvalues around λ_r). *Under Condition 1.1 and (3.3), for any $\zeta > 0$ there exists a constant C_ζ such that the following events hold with ζ -high probability.*

(i): *For the largest eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\mathcal{W})$, there exists*

$$|\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}) - \lambda_r| \leq N^{-2/3}\varphi^{C_\zeta}.$$

(ii): *For any*

$$E_1, E_2 \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, C_r],$$

there exists

$$|(F_N(E_1) - F_N(E_2)) - (F_0(E_1) - F_0(E_2))| \leq \frac{C(\log N)\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{N}. \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. Relying on the strong local MP-type law, the proof is analogous to the counterparts in [22] and [30]. Note that by Lemma 2.1, it is easy to see

$$1 - F_0(\lambda_r - \varphi^{C_\zeta}N^{-2/3}) \sim \frac{\varphi^{\frac{3}{2}C_\zeta}}{N}.$$

Then if (ii) of Theorem 4.1 holds, we have

$$\lambda_1(W) \geq \lambda_r - N^{-2/3}\varphi^{C_\zeta}.$$

Thus it suffices to prove that (ii) and

$$\lambda_1(W) \leq \lambda_r + N^{-2/3}\varphi^{C_\zeta} \quad (4.2)$$

hold with ζ -high probability.

At first we come to verify (4.2). We recall the fact that

$$C_l \leq \lambda_1(W) \leq C_r$$

holds with ζ -high probability.

Therefore, to show (4.2), it suffices to prove for any $\zeta > 0$, there exists some $C_\zeta > 0$ such that

$$\max\{\lambda_j(W) : \lambda_j(W) \leq C_r\} \leq \lambda_r + N^{-2/3}\varphi^{C_\zeta} \quad (4.3)$$

with ζ -high probability. To this end, we recall the iteration process in (3.97) and (3.98). In the sequel, we set $C_\zeta = 5D_\zeta$. By (i) of Theorem 3.2, we know that with ζ -high probability,

$$|\mathcal{D}(m)(z)| \leq \varphi^{D_\zeta} \left(\frac{\Im m_0 + \frac{1}{N\eta}}{N\eta} + \frac{1}{N\eta} \sqrt{\frac{\Im m_0 + \frac{1}{N\eta}}{N\eta}} \right) \leq C\varphi^{D_\zeta} \frac{\Im m_0 + \frac{1}{N\eta}}{N\eta}$$

for some constant $D_\zeta, C > 0$. Thus we have

$$\Lambda(z) \leq C(\log N)\varphi^{D_\zeta} \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\kappa + \eta + \delta}}, \quad \delta := \frac{\Im m_0 + \frac{1}{N\eta}}{N\eta}.$$

Now for any $E \geq \lambda_r + N^{-2/3}\varphi^{5D_\zeta}$, we choose

$$\eta := \varphi^{-D_\zeta} N^{-1/2} \kappa^{1/4}.$$

Note here

$$\kappa = E - \lambda_r \geq N^{-2/3}\varphi^{5D_\zeta}.$$

It is easy to check the following relations,

$$\kappa \gg \varphi^{D_\zeta} \eta, \quad \frac{\sqrt{\kappa}}{N\eta^2} \gg 1. \quad (4.4)$$

Note that by using (ii) of Lemma 2.3, we have

$$\Im m_0(z) = C \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{\kappa}},$$

thus by the last inequality of (4.4) we have

$$\Im m_0(z) \ll \frac{1}{N\eta} \quad (4.5)$$

and thus

$$\delta \leq \frac{C}{N\sqrt{\kappa}} + (N\eta)^{-2}.$$

Then we can get

$$\Lambda(z) \leq C\varphi^{D_\zeta} \left(\frac{\eta}{\kappa} + \frac{1}{N\eta\sqrt{\kappa}} \right) \frac{1}{N\eta} \ll \frac{1}{N\eta}. \quad (4.6)$$

where we have used the fact that

$$N\eta\sqrt{\kappa} \geq C\varphi^{5D_\zeta/2}.$$

Then (4.5) and (4.6) together imply

$$\Im m_N(z) \ll \frac{1}{N\eta}.$$

Now by the basic relation

$$N(E - \eta, E + \eta) \leq CN\eta \Im m_N(z) \ll 1$$

we know there is no eigenvalue in $[E - \eta, E + \eta]$, thus (4.3) is verified, so (4.2) follows.

For (ii), with the aid of Theorem 3.2, the proof of (4.1) is just the same as the proof of (8.6) of [30]. The main strategy is to translate the closeness between m_N and m_0 to that of the spectral distributions (F_N and F_0). Such a strategy is independent of the matrix model. Actually, we only need to set the interval $[A_1, A_2] = [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, C_r]$ in Lemma 8.1 of [30] and the remaining part of proof is totally the same as the counterpart in [30]. Thus here we do not reproduce the details.

Therefore, we complete the proof. $\square$

In the sequel we will pursue the Green function comparison approach used in [30] to prove the universality of the largest eigenvalue. The main idea is to use a functional of Green function to approximate the eigenvalue statistics, and then use a Linderberg strategy to prove the limiting behavior of this functional of Green

function is universal. Therefore, the first step is to represent the distribution of the largest eigenvalue of W_N in terms of Green function $G_N(z)$ in an approximate sense.

Note that by using the square root behavior of $\rho_0(x)$ in Lemma 2.1 again, it is easy to see for any positive constant C_ζ there is

$$1 - F_0(\lambda_r - 2\varphi^{C_\zeta} N^{-2/3}) \sim \frac{\varphi^{\frac{3}{2}C_\zeta}}{N}$$

when N is sufficiently large. Together with (4.1) we immediately get that

$$F_N(\lambda_r + 2\varphi^{C_\zeta} N^{-2/3}) - F_N(\lambda_r - 2\varphi^{C_\zeta} N^{-2/3}) \leq \frac{\varphi^{2C_\zeta}}{N} \quad (4.7)$$

with ζ -high probability. Moreover by Theorem 4.1, we also have

$$|\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}) - \lambda_r| \leq \varphi^{C_\zeta} N^{-2/3} \quad (4.8)$$

with ζ -high probability. Thus to show Theorem 1.3, it suffices to assume that

$$-\varphi^{C_\zeta} \leq s \leq \varphi^{C_\zeta}.$$

Now set

$$E_\zeta := \lambda_r + 2\varphi^{C_\zeta} N^{-2/3}.$$

For any $E \leq E_\zeta$ we denote

$$\chi_E := \mathbf{1}_{[E, E_\zeta]}.$$

For ease of presentation, we denote

$$\theta_\eta(x) := \frac{1}{\pi} \Im \frac{1}{x - i\eta} = \frac{\eta}{\pi(x^2 + \eta^2)}.$$

and the number of eigenvalues of W_N in an interval $[E_1, E_2]$ by

$$\mathcal{N}(E_1, E_2) := N(F_N(E_2) - F_N(E_1)).$$

Note by definition we have

$$\mathcal{N}(E, E_\zeta) = \text{Tr} \chi_E(H).$$

Observe that

$$\text{Tr} \chi_{E-l} * \theta_\eta(W_N) = N \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{E-l}^{E_\zeta} \Im m_N(y + i\eta) dy,$$

which can be viewed as a smoothed version of the counting function $\text{Tr} \chi_E(H)$ on scale η . An obvious advantage of $\text{Tr} \chi_{E-l} * \theta_\eta(W_N)$ is that it can be represented in terms of the Stieltjes transform. The following lemma claim that we do can replace $\text{Tr} \chi_E(H)$ by its smoothed approximation $\text{Tr} \chi_{E-l} * \theta_\eta(W_N)$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\eta_1 = N^{-2/3-9\varepsilon}$ and $l_1 = N^{-2/3-3\varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. If E satisfies*

$$|E - \lambda_r| \leq \frac{3}{2} \varphi^{C_\zeta} N^{-2/3},$$

we have

$$|\text{Tr} \chi_E(H) - \text{Tr} \chi_E * \theta_{\eta_1}(H)| \leq C (N^{-2\varepsilon} + \mathcal{N}(E - l_1, E + l_1))$$

holds with ζ -high probability.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 4.1 of [30]. Thus we will just sketch it below. By the assumption on E , (4.7) and (4.8), it is not difficult to check that we can use (4.9) of [30], that is

$$\begin{aligned} |Tr\chi_E(H) - \chi_E * \theta_{\eta_1}(H)| &\leq C(\mathcal{N}(E - l_1, E + l_1) + N^{-5\epsilon}) \\ &\quad + CN\eta_1(E_\zeta - E) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{y^2 + l_1^2} \Im m_N(E - y + il_1) dy. \end{aligned}$$

By the bounds on $\lambda_1(\mathcal{W})$ in (2.2), we know

$$\int_{E-y \geq C_r} \frac{1}{y^2 + l_1^2} \Im m_N(E - y + il_1) dy = O(1)$$

with ζ -high probability. Now we further split the interval $[-\infty, C_r]$ into $[-\infty, \lambda_r - \tilde{c})$ and $[\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, C_r]$. When $E - y \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, C_r]$, we have

$$|\Im m_N(E - y + il_1) - \Im m_0(E - y + il_1)| \leq \frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{Nl_1}$$

with ζ -high probability. When $E - y \in [-\infty, \lambda_r - \tilde{c})$, by assumption on E we have $y \geq \tilde{c}/2$. Thus we have

$$\int_{-\infty \leq E-y \leq C_r} \frac{1}{y^2 + l_1^2} \Im m_N(E - y + il_1) dy = \int_{\lambda_r - \tilde{c} \leq E-y \leq C_r} \Im m_N(E - y + il_1) dy + O(1)$$

Moreover, it is not difficult to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\lambda_r - \tilde{c} \leq E-y \leq C_r} \frac{1}{y^2 + l_1^2} \Im m_N(E - y + il_1) dy \\ &\leq \int_{\lambda_r - \tilde{c} \leq E-y \leq C_r} \frac{1}{y^2 + l_1^2} \Im m_0(E - y + il_1) dy + \frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{Nl_1} \int_{\lambda_r - \tilde{c} \leq E-y \leq C_r} \frac{1}{y^2 + l_1^2} dy \\ &\leq C \int_{\lambda_r - \tilde{c} \leq E-y \leq C_r} \frac{1}{y^2 + l_1^2} \sqrt{|E - y - \lambda_r| + l_1} dy + C \frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{Nl_1^2} \end{aligned}$$

with ζ -high probability. Then by the assumption on E and the definitions of η_1 and l_1 , it is not difficult to obtain

$$N\eta_1(E_\zeta - E) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{y^2 + l_1^2} \Im m_N(E - y + il_1) dy \leq N^{-2\epsilon}$$

through elementary calculation. Thus we conclude the proof. $\square$

With the aid of Lemma 4.2, it is not difficult to see Corollary 4.2 of [30] also holds for our non-null case. We cite it below as the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\eta_1 = N^{-2/3-9\epsilon}$, $l = \frac{1}{2}N^{-2/3-\epsilon}$ and $h(x)$ be a smooth cut-off function satisfying*

$$h(x) = 1, \quad \text{if } |x| \leq 1/9, \quad h(x) = 0 \quad \text{if } |x| \geq 2/9, \quad h'(x) \leq 0, \quad \text{if } x \geq 0.$$

Then we have

$$\mathbb{E}h(Tr\chi_{E-l} * \theta_{\eta_1}(W_N)) \leq \mathbb{P}(\lambda_1(W_N) \leq E) \leq \mathbb{E}h(Tr\chi_{E+l} * \theta_{\eta_1}(W_N)) + O(\exp(-\varphi^{C_\zeta}))$$

when N is sufficiently large.

Lemma 4.3 allows us to represent the distribution of $\lambda_1(W_N)$ in terms of the expectation of a functional of the Stieltjes transform in an approximate sense. Actually, by the discussions in [30] (see the proof of Theorem 1.1 therein), to prove Theorem 1.3, it suffices to prove the following Green function comparison theorem.

Theorem 4.4 (Green function comparison theorem around λ_r). *Let $\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}$ be two sample covariance matrices in Theorem 1.3. Let f be a real function with derivatives satisfying*

$$\sup_x \frac{|f^{(k)}(x)|}{(|x|+1)^C} \leq C, \quad k = 1, 2, 3, 4$$

with some positive constant C . Let ε be some sufficiently small positive constant and let E, E_1 and E_2 be any real numbers satisfying

$$|E - \lambda_r|, |E_1 - \lambda_r|, |E_2 - \lambda_r| \leq N^{-2/3+\varepsilon}.$$

*Moreover, we set $\eta = N^{-2/3-\varepsilon}$. If either **A** or **B** in Theorem 1.3 holds we have for $z = E + i\eta$,*

$$|\mathbb{E}f(N\eta \Im m_N^{\mathbf{u}}) - \mathbb{E}f(N\eta \Im m_N^{\mathbf{v}})| \leq N^{-C'\varepsilon} \quad (4.9)$$

and

$$\left| \mathbb{E}f\left(N \int_{E_1}^{E_2} \Im m_N^{\mathbf{u}}(x + i\eta) dx\right) - \mathbb{E}f\left(N \int_{E_1}^{E_2} \Im m_N^{\mathbf{v}}(x + i\eta) dx\right) \right| \leq N^{-C'\varepsilon} \quad (4.10)$$

with some positive constant C' when N is sufficiently large.

Remark 4.5. *Similar to Theorem 4.4 of [30], we actually need an extension of (4.10) to verify Remark 1.4 and Remark 1.6. That is, for bounded smooth function $g : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with bounded derivatives, and real numbers $E_k < \dots < E_1 < E_0$ satisfying $|E_i - \lambda_r| \leq N^{-2/3+\varepsilon}, i = 0, \dots, k$ and $\eta = N^{-2/3-\varepsilon}$ with some sufficiently small constant ε we have*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}g\left(N \int_{E_1}^{E_0} \Im m_N^{\mathbf{u}}(x + i\eta) dx, \dots, N \int_{E_k}^{E_0} \Im m_N^{\mathbf{u}}(x + i\eta) dx\right) - \mathbb{E}g\left(N \int_{E_1}^{E_0} \Im m_N^{\mathbf{v}}(x + i\eta) dx, \dots, N \int_{E_k}^{E_0} \Im m_N^{\mathbf{v}}(x + i\eta) dx\right) \right| \leq N^{-C'} \quad (4.11)$$

with some positive constant C' when N is sufficiently large. The proof of (4.11) is similar to that of (4.10) thus we leave it to the reader.

Now we are at the stage to prove our main results.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Given Lemma 4.3 and Theorem 4.4, the proof of Theorem 1.3 is the same as that for the null case. We refer to the proof of Theorem 1.1 of [30] for details. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Theorem 1.5 follows from Theorem 1.3, Theorem 1 of [10] and Proposition 2 of [28] immediately. $\square$

It remains to prove Theorem 4.4 in the sequel.

Proof of Theorem 4.4. We will only verify (4.9) below, the proof of (4.10) can be taken similarly. Let $\gamma \in \{1, 2, \dots, N+1\}$ and set X_γ to be the matrix whose first $\gamma-1$ columns are the same as those of $X^\mathbf{u}$ and the remaining $N-\gamma+1$ columns are the same as those of $X^\mathbf{v}$. Thus we have $X_1 = X^\mathbf{u}$ and $X_{N+1} = X^\mathbf{v}$. Correspondingly, we set

$$W_{N,\gamma} = X_\gamma^* \Sigma X_\gamma, \quad \mathcal{W}_{N,\gamma} = \Sigma^{1/2} X_\gamma X_\gamma^* \Sigma^{1/2}.$$

To verify (4.9), it suffices to check that for every γ the following estimate holds

$$\mathbb{E}F(\eta \Im \text{Tr}(W_{N,\gamma} - z)^{-1}) - \mathbb{E}F(\eta \Im \text{Tr}(W_{N,\gamma+1} - z)^{-1}) = O(N^{-1-C'\epsilon}).$$

Note that X_γ and $X_{\gamma+1}$ only differ in one column, thus

$$X_\gamma^{(\gamma)} = X_{\gamma+1}^{(\gamma)},$$

which implies

$$W_{N,\gamma}^{(\gamma)} = W_{N,\gamma+1}^{(\gamma)}, \quad \mathcal{W}_{N,\gamma}^{(\gamma)} = \mathcal{W}_{N,\gamma+1}^{(\gamma)}.$$

Therefore, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}F(\eta \Im \text{Tr}(W_{N,\gamma} - z)^{-1}) - \mathbb{E}F(\eta \Im \text{Tr}(W_{N,\gamma+1} - z)^{-1}) \\ &= \left(\mathbb{E}F(\eta \Im \text{Tr}(W_{N,\gamma} - z)^{-1}) - \mathbb{E}F\left(\eta \Im [\text{Tr}(W_{N,\gamma}^{(\gamma)} - z)^{-1} - z^{-1}]\right) \right) \\ & \quad - \left(\mathbb{E}F(\eta \Im \text{Tr}(W_{N,\gamma+1} - z)^{-1}) - \mathbb{E}F\left(\eta \Im [\text{Tr}(W_{N,\gamma+1}^{(\gamma)} - z)^{-1} - z^{-1}]\right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

Set

$$\mathcal{M}_k(i) = \{(\mathbf{E}(\Re \sqrt{N} x_{ji})^l (\Im \sqrt{N} x_{ji})^m, j, l, m) : j = 1, \dots, M, m+l \leq k\}$$

be the set of first k moments of the entries of $\mathbf{x}_i$ indexed by j, l, m . By (4.12) it suffices to show for any sample covariance matrix W_N satisfying Condition 1.1, the following two lemmas hold.

Lemma 4.6. *For any random matrix W_N satisfying Condition 1.1, for $z = E + i\eta$ if there exists*

$$|E - \lambda_r| \leq N^{-2/3+\epsilon}, \quad N^{-2/3-\epsilon} \ll \eta \ll N^{-2/3},$$

then we have

$$\mathbb{E}F(N\eta \Im m_N(z)) - \mathbb{E}F(N\eta \Im [m_N^{(i)}(z) - (Nz)^{-1}]) = A(X^{(i)}, \mathcal{M}_2(i)) + N^{-1-C\epsilon} \quad (4.13)$$

when Σ is diagonal and

$$\mathbb{E}F(N\eta \Im m_N(z)) - \mathbb{E}F(N\eta \Im [m_N^{(i)}(z) - (Nz)^{-1}]) = B(X^{(i)}, \mathcal{M}_4(i)) + N^{-1-C\epsilon} \quad (4.14)$$

for general Σ , where $A(X^{(i)}, \mathcal{M}_2(i))$ is a functional depending on the distribution of $X^{(i)}$ and $\mathcal{M}_2(i)$ only and similarly $B(X^{(i)}, \mathcal{M}_4(i))$ is a functional depending on the distribution of $X^{(i)}$ and $\mathcal{M}_4(i)$ only.

Now we denote the set $\mathcal{M}_k(i)$ for $X^\mathbf{u}$ and $X^\mathbf{v}$ by $\mathcal{M}_k^\mathbf{u}(i)$ and $\mathcal{M}_k^\mathbf{v}(i)$ respectively. Then we also have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.7. *Under Condition 1.1, if $\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{u}}$ matches $\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{u}}$ to order 2, we have*

$$\max_{\gamma} |A(X_{\gamma}^{(\gamma)}, \mathcal{M}_2^{\mathbf{u}}(\gamma)) - A(X_{\gamma}^{(\gamma)}, \mathcal{M}_2^{\mathbf{v}}(\gamma))| = O(e^{-c_0(\log N)^C}) \quad (4.15)$$

with some positive constant c_0 and $C > 1$. If $\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{u}}$ matches $\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{u}}$ to order 4, we have

$$\max_{\gamma} |B(X_{\gamma}^{(\gamma)}, \mathcal{M}_4^{\mathbf{u}}(\gamma)) - B(X_{\gamma}^{(\gamma)}, \mathcal{M}_4^{\mathbf{v}}(\gamma))| = O(e^{-c_0(\log N)^C}). \quad (4.16)$$

Here A and B are the functionals in Lemma 4.6.

It is obvious that (4.9) follows from Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 4.7. The proof of (4.10) can be taken analogously. Thus we conclude the proof of Theorem 4.4 assuming the validity of Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 4.7. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 4.6. Without loss of generality, we just check the result for $i = 1$. By the discussion in [30](see (4.24)-(4.30) therein) we have with ζ -high probability the following estimate holds,

$$\begin{aligned} & F(N\eta\mathfrak{S}m_N(z)) - F(N\eta\mathfrak{S}[m_N^{(1)}(z) - (Nz)^{-1}]) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{1}{k!} F^{(k)}(N\eta\mathfrak{S}[m_N^{(1)}(z) - (Nz)^{-1}])(\mathfrak{S}y)^k + O(N^{-4/3+C\varepsilon}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

where

$$y = \eta z G_{11} \mathbf{r}_1^* (\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2 \mathbf{r}_1. \quad (4.18)$$

Here we have used the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} & Nm_N(z) - N[m_N^{(1)}(z) - (Nz)^{-1}] = \text{Tr}G - \text{Tr}G^{(1)} + z^{-1} \\ &= \text{Tr}\mathcal{G} - \text{Tr}\mathcal{G}^{(1)} = -zG_{11}\mathbf{r}_1^* (\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2 \mathbf{r}_1. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, note that by

$$|\mathbf{r}_1^* (\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2 \mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2 \Sigma| \leq \varphi^{C_{\zeta}} \frac{1}{N} \sqrt{\text{Tr}|\mathcal{G}^{(1)}|^4}$$

with ζ -high probability, we have for z satisfying the assumption in Lemma 4.6, there exists

$$|\mathbf{r}_1^* (\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2 \mathbf{r}_1| \leq \frac{\varphi^{C_{\zeta}}}{N} \text{Tr}|\mathcal{G}^{(1)}|^2 = C\varphi^{C_{\zeta}} \frac{\mathfrak{S}\text{Tr}\mathcal{G}^{(1)}}{N\eta} \leq N^{1/3+C\varepsilon} \quad (4.19)$$

with ζ -high probability. Thus (4.17) holds with ζ -high probability.

Now let

$$D = \frac{m_0 - G_{11}}{G_{11}},$$

then with ζ -high probability we can write

$$G_{11} = \frac{m_0}{D+1} = m_0 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-D)^k \quad (4.20)$$

since with ζ -high probability $|D| \leq N^{-1/3+2\varepsilon}$ which is implied by (ii) of Theorem 3.2. Inserting (4.20) into (4.18) we can write

$$y = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} y_k, \quad y_k := \eta z m_0(z) (-D)^{k-1} \mathbf{r}_1^* (\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2 \mathbf{r}_1.$$

By (4.19), we know

$$|y| \leq O(N^{-1/3+C\varepsilon}).$$

Moreover, by the bound on D , we can easily get

$$|y_k| \leq O(N^{-k/3+C\varepsilon}).$$

Then it is not difficult to find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} F(N\eta \Im m_N(z)) - F(N\eta \Im[m_N^{(1)}(z) - (Nz)^{-1}]) \\ &= \mathbb{E} F^{(1)}(N\eta \Im[m_N^{(1)}(z) - (Nz)^{-1}]) (\Im y_1 + \Im y_2 + \Im y_3) \\ &+ \mathbb{E} F^{(2)}(N\eta \Im[m_N^{(1)}(z) - (Nz)^{-1}]) \left(\frac{1}{2} (\Im y_1)^2 + \Im y_1 \Im y_2\right) \\ &+ \mathbb{E} F^{(3)}(N\eta \Im[m_N^{(1)}(z) - (Nz)^{-1}]) \left(\frac{1}{6} (\Im y_1)^3 + O(N^{-4/3+C\varepsilon})\right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

Now we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.8. *Assume that $z = E + i\eta$ satisfies*

$$|E - \lambda_r| \leq N^{-2/3+\varepsilon}, \quad N^{-2/3-\varepsilon} \leq \eta \ll N^{-2/3}.$$

Then when Σ is diagonal, we have

$$|(\mathcal{G}^{(1)}(z))_{ij}| \leq N^{C\varepsilon}, \quad \text{and} \quad |([\mathcal{G}^{(1)}(z)]^2)_{ij}| \leq N^{1/3+C\varepsilon} \quad (4.22)$$

with ζ -high probability.

For general Σ under (iii) of Condition 1.1 we have

$$|\Im(\Sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{G}^{(1)}(z) \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}| \leq N^{1/3+C\varepsilon} \quad (4.23)$$

with ζ -high probability.

Now we prove (4.13) and (4.14) assuming Lemma 4.8 and prove Lemma 4.8 later. At first, we come to verify (4.13) when Σ is diagonal. Recall (4.21), we start from the third term on the r.h.s of (4.21). Denote

$$\varpi = \Im \eta z m_0, \quad \varrho = \Re \eta z m_0.$$

Thus we have

$$\Im y_1 = \varpi (\Re \mathbf{r}_1^* (\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2 \mathbf{r}_1) + \varrho (\Im \mathbf{r}_1^* (\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2 \mathbf{r}_1)$$

For ease of presentation, we denote the real part and imaginary part of a complex number A by $A[0]$ and $A[1]$ respectively. Then it is easy to see that $\mathbb{E}_1(\Im y_1)^3$ is a summation of some terms in the form of

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{a+b=3\}} \varpi^a \varrho^b \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_6} \prod_{m=1}^3 (\Sigma^{1/2} (\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2 \Sigma^{1/2})_{k_{2i-1} k_{2i}} [\alpha_i] \mathbb{E} \prod_{l=1}^6 x_{k_l} [\beta_l], \quad (4.24)$$

where α_i, β_j are 0 or 1 and a, b are nonnegative integers. Thus it suffices to deal with quantities in the form of (4.24) below.

Now we classify the terms in the summation (4.24) by $\{k_1, \dots, k_6\}$. If there is a k_j appears only once in $\{k_1, \dots, k_6\}$, then such term is zero obviously. If every k_j appears exactly twice, then such term only depend on $X^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{M}_2(1)$. Therefore, it remains to consider the terms that there is at least one k_j appears at least three times and no k_j appears only once. It is obviously that the total number of such terms is $O(N^2)$. Now by using (4.22) in Lemma 4.8, we see the total contribution of these terms is less than

$$CN^{-1}|\eta z m_0|^3 \max_{ij} |(\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2 \Sigma^{1/2})_{ij}|^3 \leq CN^{-1}|\eta z m_0|^3 \max_{ij} |(\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2_{ij}|^3 = O(N^{-2+C\varepsilon})$$

with ζ -high probability. Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathfrak{Y}_1)^3 = A_1(X^{(1)}, \mathcal{M}_2(1)) + O(N^{-2+C\varepsilon}) \quad (4.25)$$

for some functional A_1 depending on the distribution of $X^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{M}_2(1)$ only.

Analogously, by invoking (4.22) we can get

$$\mathbb{E}((\mathfrak{Y}_1)^2 + 2(\mathfrak{Y}_1)(\mathfrak{Y}_2)) = A_2(X^{(1)}, \mathcal{M}_2(1)) + O(N^{-5/3+C\varepsilon}) \quad (4.26)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathfrak{Y}_1 + \mathfrak{Y}_2 + \mathfrak{Y}_3) = A_3(X^{(1)}, \mathcal{M}_2(1)) + O(N^{-4/3+C\varepsilon}) \quad (4.27)$$

with some functionals A_2 and A_3 depending on $X^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{M}_2(1)$ only. Inserting (4.25)-(4.27) into (4.21) we obtain the conclusion when Σ is diagonal.

Now we come to prove (4.16) for more general Σ . Note that for $\mathbb{E}_1(\mathfrak{Y}_1)^3$, by (4.24), it suffices to bound the terms in which all $k_i, i = 1, \dots, 6$ are the same, since all the other terms only depend on the distribution of $X^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{M}_4(1)$. In other words, we need to bound the terms in which $\mathbb{E}|x_{ij}|^6$ appears. It is not difficult to see that the total contribution of such terms in $\mathbb{E}_1(\mathfrak{Y}_1)^3$, $\mathbb{E}_1((\mathfrak{Y}_1)^2 + 2(\mathfrak{Y}_1)(\mathfrak{Y}_2))$ and $\mathbb{E}(\mathfrak{Y}_1 + \mathfrak{Y}_2 + \mathfrak{Y}_3)$ can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & CN^{-3} \sum_k \eta^3 |(\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2 \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}|^3 \\ & + CN^{-3} \sum_k \eta^2 |(\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2 \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}| |(\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2 \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}|^2 \\ & + CN^{-3} \sum_k \eta |(\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathcal{G}^{(1)}) \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}|^2 |(\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2 \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}| \end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$

with some positive constant C . Now note the elementary relation

$$|(\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2 \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}| \leq \eta^{-1} |\Im(\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathcal{G}^{(1)}) \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}| \leq \eta^{-1} |(\Sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{G}^{(1)} \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}|. \quad (4.29)$$

Thus it suffices to bound the last term of (4.28). Moreover, by the first inequality of (4.29) and (4.23) we see

$$|(\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2 \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}| \leq N^{1+C\varepsilon}.$$

Now we come to estimate the last term of (4.28).

$$\begin{aligned}
& N^{-3} \sum_k \eta |(\Sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{G}^{(1)} \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}|^2 |(\Sigma^{1/2} (\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^2 \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}| \leq N^{-8/3+C\varepsilon} \sum_k |(\Sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{G}^{(1)} \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk}|^2 \\
& \leq N^{-8/3+C\varepsilon} \sum_k \sum_j |(\Sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{G}^{(1)} \Sigma^{1/2})_{kj}|^2 \leq N^{-8/3+C\varepsilon} [\Sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{G}^{(1)} \Sigma (\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^* \Sigma^{1/2}]_{kk} \\
& \leq C' N^{-8/3+C\varepsilon} (\Sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{G}^{(1)} (\mathcal{G}^{(1)})^* \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk} = C' N^{-8/3+C\varepsilon} \eta^{-1} \Im(\Sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{G}^{(1)} \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk} = O(N^{-5/3+C\varepsilon}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we complete the proof of (4.14). $\square$

Now we come to verify Lemma 4.7.

Proof of Lemma 4.7. Note by the discussion in the proof of Lemma 4.6, it is easy to see (4.15) and (4.16) hold by Definition 1.2 and Lemma 4.8. $\square$

At the end, we come to prove Lemma 4.8.

Proof of Lemma 4.8. Since $\mathcal{G}^{(i)}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are only different in dimension, we will just work on $\mathcal{G}$ for ease of presentation. We will prove (4.22) and (4.23) separately.

Proof of (4.22). Note when Σ is diagonal, we can denote

$$\Sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_M^2).$$

Let $\Sigma^{[j]}$ be the $(M-1) \times (M-1)$ minor of Σ obtained by deleting the j -th column and row of Σ . Moreover, we denote the j -th row of X by $\mathcal{X}_j^*$ and the $(M-1) \times N$ submatrix obtained by deleting $\mathcal{X}_j^*$ from X by $X^{[j]}$. Correspondingly, we will use the notation

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}^{[j]} &= (\Sigma^{[j]})^{1/2} X^{[j]} (X^{[j]})^* (\Sigma^{[j]}), \quad W^{[j]} = (X^{[j]})^* \Sigma^{[j]} X^{[j]}, \\
\mathcal{G}^{[j]} &= (\mathcal{W}_N^{[j]} - z)^{-1}, \quad G^{[j]} = (W^{[j]} - z)^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_N &= \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 \mathcal{X}_1^* \\ \sigma_2 \mathcal{X}_2^* \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_M \mathcal{X}_M^* \end{pmatrix} (\sigma_1 \mathcal{X}_1, \sigma_2 \mathcal{X}_2, \dots, \sigma_M \mathcal{X}_M) \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1^2 \mathcal{X}_1^* \mathcal{X}_1 & \sigma_1 \mathcal{X}_1^* (X^{[1]})^* (\Sigma^{[1]})^{1/2} \\ \sigma_1 (\Sigma^{[1]})^{1/2} X^{[1]} \mathcal{X}_1 & (\Sigma^{[1]})^{1/2} X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* (\Sigma^{[1]})^{1/2} \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

Then by Schur complement we have

$$\mathcal{G}_{11} = \frac{1}{-z - z \sigma_1^2 \mathcal{X}_1^* ((X^{[1]})^* \Sigma^{[1]} X^{[1]} - z)^{-1} \mathcal{X}_1} = \frac{1}{-z - z \sigma_1^2 \mathcal{X}_1^* G^{[1]} \mathcal{X}_1}$$

Now observe that

$$\left| \mathcal{X}_1^* G^{[1]} \mathcal{X}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} G^{[1]} \right| \leq \varphi^{C_\zeta} \sqrt{\frac{\Im \text{Tr} G^{[1]}}{N^2 \eta}}$$

holds with ζ -high probability. Now note that we have

$$\text{Tr}G^{[1]} = \text{Tr}\mathcal{G}^{[1]} - \frac{N-M+1}{z} = \text{Tr}\mathcal{G} - \frac{N-M+1}{z} + O(\eta^{-1}) = \text{Tr}G + O(\eta^{-1}).$$

Therefore, we have for $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$

$$\mathcal{X}_1^* G^{[1]} \mathcal{X}_1 = m_N(z) + o(1) = m_0(z) + o(1)$$

with ζ -high probability, which implies

$$\mathcal{G}_{11} = \frac{1}{-z - z\sigma_1^2 m_0(z) + o(1)}.$$

Analogously, we have

$$\mathcal{G}_{ii} = \frac{1}{-z - z\sigma_i^2 m_0(z) + o(1)}$$

with ζ -high probability. Then by (iv) of Lemma 2.3 we obtain for $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$,

$$|\mathcal{G}_{ii}(z)| = O(1) \quad (4.30)$$

with ζ -high probability, thus we get the bounds for $\mathcal{G}_{ii}$ when Σ is diagonal. Now we use (4.30) to derive a delocalization result on the eigenvectors of $\mathcal{W}_N$ in the edge case. Then we use the delocalization result to bound $\mathcal{G}_{ij}$ and $(\mathcal{G})_{ij}^2$.

We denote the unit eigenvector of $\mathcal{W}_N$ corresponding to $\lambda_k(\mathcal{W})$ by $\mathbf{u}_k = (u_{k1}, \dots, u_{kM})$. We have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.9. *When Σ is diagonal, if $\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}) \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}/2, C_r]$, we have*

$$\max_i |u_{ki}|^2 \leq \varphi^{C_\zeta} \frac{1}{N}$$

with ζ -high probability.

Proof of Lemma 4.9. By (4.30) and spectral decomposition, we have

$$\Im \mathcal{G}_{ii} = \sum_{k=1}^M \frac{\eta}{(\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}) - E)^2 + \eta^2} |u_{ki}|^2 = O(1)$$

Now we set $\eta = \varphi^{C_\zeta} N^{-1}$. Since (4.30) holds uniformly for all $z \in S_r(\tilde{c}, 5C_\zeta)$, we set $E = \lambda_k(\mathcal{W})$ for some $\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}) \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}/2, C_r]$, then

$$\frac{\eta}{(\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}) - E)^2 + \eta^2} |u_{ki}|^2 = \varphi^{-C_\zeta} N |u_{ki}|^2 = O(1),$$

which implies Lemma 4.9 immediately. Thus we conclude the proof. $\square$

Now we proceed to prove (4.22). Note that by spectral decomposition, for $z = E + i\eta$ satisfying the assumption in Lemma 4.8 and $\alpha = 1, 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(\mathcal{G}^\alpha(z))_{ij}| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^M \frac{1}{|\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}) - z|^\alpha} |u_{ki}| |u_{kj}| \leq \sum_{k: \lambda_k \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}/2, C_r]} \frac{1}{|\lambda_k - z|^2} |u_{ki}| |u_{kj}| + O(1) \\ &= \varphi^{C_\zeta} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^M \frac{1}{|\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}) - z|^\alpha} + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Then the first inequality in (4.22) ($\alpha = 1$) can be obtained through a discussion similar to that in the proof of (3.43) based on Lemma 3.11. When $\alpha = 2$, we see

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^M \frac{1}{|\lambda_k(\mathcal{W}) - z|^2} \sim \eta^{-1} \Im m_N(z)$$

which implies the second inequality in (4.22). $\square$

Now we come to prove (4.23).

Proof of (4.23). For ease of presentation, we will work with $\mathcal{G}$ instead of $\mathcal{G}^{(1)}$. Note that

$$\Sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{G} \Sigma^{1/2} = \Sigma^{1/2} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} X X^* \Sigma^{1/2} - zI \right)^{-1} \Sigma^{1/2} = (X X^* - z \Sigma^{-1})^{-1}. \quad (4.31)$$

For convenience, we will denote

$$\Phi := \Sigma^{-1}, \quad \Delta := \Sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{G} \Sigma^{1/2}.$$

Thus we have

$$\Delta_{kk} = [(X X^* - z \Phi)^{-1}]_{kk}.$$

We will only provide the estimate for $\Im \Delta_{11}$ in the sequel, the others can be estimated analogously. We need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $z_0 := E_0 + i\eta_0$ satisfy*

$$E_0 \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, \lambda_r + N^{-2/3+\varepsilon}], \quad \eta_0 := N^{-2/3+A_0\varepsilon}$$

with some positive constant $A_0 > 1$. Under Condition 1.1, for any constant $\zeta > 0$ we have

$$|\Delta_{11}(z_0)| \leq C \eta_0^{-1/2} \quad (4.32)$$

with ζ -high probability.

We postpone the proof of Lemma 4.10 to the end of this section and proceed to prove (4.23) assuming Lemma 4.10. By (4.32) and spectral decomposition we have

$$\Im \Delta_{11}(z_0) = \sum_i \frac{\eta_0}{(\lambda_i(\mathcal{W}) - E_0)^2 + \eta_0^2} (\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_i^* \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk} \leq C \eta_0^{-1/2} \quad (4.33)$$

with ζ -high probability. Now if $\lambda_i(\mathcal{W}) \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, \lambda_r + N^{-2/3+\varepsilon}]$, we can set $E_0 = \lambda_i$, thus (4.33) implies that

$$(\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_i^* \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk} \leq C \eta_0^{1/2} \leq N^{-1/3+A_0\varepsilon}. \quad (4.34)$$

Now we use (4.34) to bound $\Im \Delta_{11}(z)$ for all z satisfying the assumption of Lemma 4.8. By using spectral decomposition again we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Im \Delta_{11}(z) &= \sum_i^M \frac{\eta}{(\lambda_i(\mathcal{W}) - E)^2 + \eta^2} (\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_i^* \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk} \\ &\leq N^{-1/3+A_0\varepsilon} \sum_{i: \lambda_i \in [\lambda_r - \tilde{c}, \lambda_r + N^{-2/3+\varepsilon}]} \frac{\eta}{(\lambda_i(\mathcal{W}) - E)^2 + \eta^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + C\eta \sum_{i: \lambda_i \leq \lambda_r - \tilde{c}} (\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_i^* \Sigma^{1/2})_{kk} \\
& \leq N^{2/3+A_0\varepsilon} \Im m_N(z) + C\eta \\
& \leq N^{2/3+A_0\varepsilon} (\Im m_0(z) + \frac{1}{N\eta}) + C\eta \\
& \leq N^{1/3+2A_0\varepsilon}
\end{aligned}$$

with ζ -high probability. Thus (4.23) follows if we replace $\mathcal{G}$ by $\mathcal{G}^{(1)}$ $\square$

Therefore, we conclude the proof of Lemma 4.8 $\square$

It remains to prove Lemma 4.10. We do it as follows.

Proof of Lemma 4.10. At first, we recall the notations $\mathcal{X}_j^*$, $X^{[j]}$, $\Sigma^{[j]}$, $W^{[j]}$ in the proof of (4.22). Moreover, we write

$$\Sigma^{-1} = \Phi := \begin{pmatrix} \phi_{11} & \Phi_1^* \\ \Phi_1 & \Phi^{[1]} \end{pmatrix},$$

where ϕ_{11} is the $(1,1)$ entry of Φ and Φ_1 is its first column with ϕ_{11} removed. Now by using Schur complement to (4.31) we can get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{11}(z_0) &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{X}_1^* \mathcal{X}_1 - z_0 \phi_{11} - (\mathcal{X}_1^* (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi_1^*) (X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]})^{-1} (X^{[1]} \mathcal{X}_1 - z_0 \Phi_1)} \\
&:= \frac{1}{D_1 + D_2 + D_3},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
D_1 := D_1(z_0) &= \mathcal{X}_1^* \mathcal{X}_1 - z_0 \phi_{11} - \mathcal{X}_1^* (X^{[1]})^* \left(X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]} \right)^{-1} X^{[1]} \mathcal{X}_1, \\
D_2 := D_2(z_0) &= -z_0^2 \Phi_1^* \left(X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]} \right)^{-1} \Phi_1, \\
D_3 := D_3(z_0) &= z_0 \mathcal{X}_1^* (X^{[1]})^* \left(X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]} \right)^{-1} \Phi_1 \\
&\quad + z_0 \Phi_1^* \left(X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]} \right)^{-1} X^{[1]} \mathcal{X}_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$|\Delta_{11}| \leq \min\{(|\Im(D_1 + D_2 + D_3)|)^{-1}, |\Re(D_1 + D_2 + D_3)|^{-1}\}.$$

Hence it suffices to show that with ζ -high probability,

$$|\Im(D_1 + D_2 + D_3)| \geq C\eta_0^{1/2} \quad (4.35)$$

when

$$|\Re(D_1 + D_2 + D_3)| \leq N^{1/6} \quad (4.36)$$

for some positive constants C . In the sequel, we will prove (4.35) under the assumption of (4.36).

Note that

$$D_1 = \mathcal{X}_1^* \mathcal{X}_1 - z_0 \phi_{11}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\mathcal{X}_1^*(X^{[1]})^*(\Phi^{[1]})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left((\Phi^{[1]})^{-\frac{1}{2}} X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* (\Phi^{[1]})^{-\frac{1}{2}} - z_0 \right)^{-1} (\Phi^{[1]})^{-\frac{1}{2}} X^{[1]} \mathcal{X}_1 \\
&= \mathcal{X}_1^* \mathcal{X}_1 - z_0 \phi_{11} - \mathcal{X}_1^* (X^{[1]})^* (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1} X^{[1]} \left(X^{[1]} (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \right)^{-1} \mathcal{X}_1 \\
&= -z_0 \phi_{11} - z_0 \mathcal{X}_1^* \left(X^{[1]} (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \right)^{-1} \mathcal{X}_1.
\end{aligned}$$

For ease of presentation we denote

$$\tilde{G}^{[1]}(z_0) := \left(X^{[1]} (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \right)^{-1}.$$

Thus by Lemma 3.4 we have

$$D_1 = -z_0 \phi_{11} - z_0 \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \tilde{G}^{[1]}(z_0) + O\left(\frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{N} \|\tilde{G}^{[1]}(z_0)\|_{HS}\right)$$

with ζ -high probability. At first, similar to (3.43), we can show that with ζ -high probability.

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \tilde{G}^{[1]}(z_0) \right| \leq (\log N)^{O(1)}. \quad (4.37)$$

Moreover we have

$$\|\tilde{G}^{[1]}(z_0)\|_{HS} \leq C \sqrt{\frac{\Im \text{Tr} \tilde{G}^{[1]}(z_0)}{\eta_0}},$$

which together with (4.37) imply that

$$\Re D_1(z_0) \leq (\log N)^{O(1)} \quad (4.38)$$

and

$$\Im D_1(z_0) = -E_0 \frac{1}{N} \Im \text{Tr} \tilde{G}^{[1]}(z_0) + O\left(\varphi^{C_\zeta} \sqrt{\frac{\Im \text{Tr} \tilde{G}^{[1]}(z_0)}{N^2 \eta_0}}\right) + O((\log N)^{O(1)} \eta_0)$$

with ζ -high probability.

Now for D_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Re D_2(z_0) &= -(E_0^2 - \eta_0^2) \Re \Phi_1^* \left(X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]} \right)^{-1} \Phi_1 \\
&\quad + 2E_0 \eta_0 \Im \Phi_1^* \left(X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]} \right)^{-1} \Phi_1,
\end{aligned} \quad (4.39)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Im D_2(z_0) &= -(E_0^2 - \eta_0^2) \Im \Phi_1^* \left(X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]} \right)^{-1} \Phi_1 \\
&\quad - 2E_0 \eta_0 \Re \Phi_1^* \left(X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]} \right)^{-1} \Phi_1.
\end{aligned} \quad (4.40)$$

And for D_3 , we denote

$$\mathbf{b} := z_0 (X^{[1]})^* \left(X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]} \right)^{-1} \Phi_1,$$

thus

$$D_3 = \mathcal{X}_1^* \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}^* \mathcal{X}_1^*.$$

Then by Lemma 3.4 we have

$$|D_3| \leq \frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{\sqrt{N}} \|\mathbf{b}\| \leq \frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{\Phi_1^* |X^{[1]}(X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]}|^{-2} \Phi_1}$$

with ζ -high probability. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi_1^* |X^{[1]}(X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]}|^{-2} \Phi_1 \\ &= \Phi_1^* (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1/2} \left| (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1/2} X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1/2} - z_0 \right|^{-1} \\ & \quad \times (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1} \left| (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1/2} X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1/2} - z_0 \right|^{-1} (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1/2} \Phi_1 \\ &\leq C \Phi_1^* (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1/2} \left| (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1/2} X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1/2} - z_0 \right|^{-2} (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1/2} \Phi_1 \\ &\leq C \eta_0^{-1} \Im \Phi_1^* (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1/2} \left((\Phi^{[1]})^{-1/2} X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1/2} - z_0 \right)^{-1} (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1/2} \Phi_1 \\ &= C \eta_0^{-1} \Im \Phi_1^* \left(X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]} \right)^{-1} \Phi_1 \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$|D_3| \leq \frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{\eta_0^{-1} \Im \Phi_1^* \left(X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]} \right)^{-1} \Phi_1} \quad (4.41)$$

with ζ -high probability. Now note that we have the crude bound

$$\Im \Phi_1^* \left(X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]} \right)^{-1} \Phi_1 \leq C \eta_0^{-1}.$$

Then by (4.38), (4.39) and (4.41) we can see that

$$|\Re(D_1 + D_2 + D_3)| \geq C |\Re \Phi_1^* \left(X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]} \right)^{-1} \Phi_1| + O(N^{1/6-C\varepsilon}).$$

Then by assumption (4.36) we have

$$|\Re \Phi_1^* \left(X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]} \right)^{-1} \Phi_1| \leq O(N^{1/6}) \quad (4.42)$$

Inserting (4.42) into (4.40) we have

$$\Im D_2 = -(E_0^2 - \eta_0^2) \Im \Phi_1^* \left(X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]} \right)^{-1} \Phi_1 + O(N^{-1/2+C\varepsilon}). \quad (4.43)$$

Now we claim that

$$\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \tilde{G}^{[1]}(z_0) = m_N(z_0) + O\left(\frac{1}{N\eta_0}\right), \quad \frac{1}{N} \Im \text{Tr} \tilde{G}^{[1]}(z_0) \geq C\sqrt{\kappa_0 + \eta_0}, \quad (4.44)$$

where $\kappa_0 := |\lambda_r - E_0|$. Now we will prove (4.35) assuming (4.44) and postpone the proof of (4.44) to the end. With the aid of (4.44), we have

$$\Im D_1 = -E_0 \Im m_N(z_0) + O(N^{-1/3-C\varepsilon}). \quad (4.45)$$

For convenience, we set

$$t_0 = \Im \Phi_1^* \left(X^{[1]} (X^{[1]})^* - z_0 \Phi^{[1]} \right)^{-1} \Phi_1.$$

Combining (4.41), (4.43) and (4.45) we have

$$\Im(D_1 + D_2 + D_3) = -E_0 \Im m_N(z_0) - (E_0^2 - \eta_0^2)t_0 + O\left(\frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{\sqrt{N}\eta_0}t_0^{1/2}\right) + O(N^{-1/3-C_\varepsilon})$$

with ζ -high probability. Now observe that $E_0 \Im m_N(z_0)$ and $(E_0^2 - \eta_0^2)t_0$ have the same sign, thus it suffices to show that

$$t_0 \gg \frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{\sqrt{N}\eta_0}t_0^{1/2}, \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\varphi^{C_\zeta}}{\sqrt{N}\eta_0}t_0^{1/2} \ll \sqrt{\kappa_0 + \eta_0}$$

holds, which is obvious by the definition of η_0 .

Therefore, it suffices to verify (4.44) in the sequel. Now recall $W^{[1]}$ and $G^{[1]}$ defined in the proof of (4.22). We start from the observation

$$W^{[1]} = (X^{[1]})^* \Sigma^{[1]} X^{[1]} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_N & (X^{[1]})^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{0}_{M-1}^* \\ \mathbf{0}_{M-1} & \Sigma^{[1]} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_N^* \\ X^{[1]} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{0}_n$ is $n \times 1$ zero vector. Then it is easy to see that

$$\text{rank}(W - W^{[1]}) \leq 4.$$

Moreover, we can write

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} & \Sigma_1^* \\ \Sigma_1 & \Sigma^{[1]} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then by $\Phi \Sigma = I_M$, we can easily get

$$(\Phi^{[1]})^{-1} = \Sigma^{[1]} + (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1} \Phi_1 \Sigma_1^*.$$

Thus

$$\text{rank}((X^{[1]})^* (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1} X^{[1]} - W^{[1]}) \leq 1.$$

Hence we have

$$\text{rank}(W - (X^{[1]})^* (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1} X^{[1]}) \leq 5.$$

Now we denote the ESD of $(X^{[1]})^* (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1} X^{[1]}$ by $F_N^{[1]}$. Then we use the rank inequality (see Lemma 2.2 of [1] for instance)

$$|F_N - F^{[1]}| \leq \frac{1}{N} \text{rank}(W - (X^{[1]})^* (\Phi^{[1]})^{-1} X^{[1]}) \leq \frac{5}{N}.$$

Then similar to (3.21), we can get (4.44). Thus we conclude the proof. $\square$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are very grateful to Laszlo Erdős, Horng-Tzer Yau and Jun Yin for useful comments which helped to improve the organization significantly.

REFERENCES

- [1] Z. D. Bai. Methodologies in spectral analysis of large-dimensional random matrices, a review. *Statist. Sinica* **9**, 611-677.
- [2] Z. D. Bai, J. Hu, and W. Zhou. Convergence rates to the Marcenko-Pastur type distribution. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*. **122**, 68-92. (2012)
- [3] Z.D. Bai, J. Silverstein. Spectral analysis of large dimensional random matrices. Science Press, Beijing. (2006)
- [4] Z.D. Bai, J.F. Yao. Central limit theorems for eigenvalues in a spiked population model. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **44**, No. 3, 447-474. (2008)
- [5] Z.D. Bai, Y.Q. Yin, and P.R. Krishnaiah. On the limiting empirical distribution of product of two random matrices when the underlying distribution is isotropic. *J. Multiv. Ana.*, **19**, 189-200. (1986)
- [6] J. Baik, G. Ben Arous, and S. Péché. Phase transition of the largest eigenvalue for nonnull complex sample covariance matrices. *Ann. Probab.* **33**, No. 5, 1643-1697. (2005)
- [7] Z. G. Bao, G. M. Pan, and W. Zhou. Tracy-Widom law for the extreme eigenvalues of sample correlation matrices. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, **17**, 1-32. (2012)
- [8] A. Bloemendal, B. Virág. Limits of spiked random matrices II. arXiv preprint arXiv:1109.3704.
- [9] D. Jonsson. Some limit theorems for the eigenvalues of a sample covariance matrix. *J. Multiv. Anal.*, **12**: 1-38. (1982)
- [10] N. El Karoui, Tracy-Widom limit for the largest eigenvalue of a large class of complex sample covariance matrices. *Ann. Probab.* **35**, No. 2, 663-714. (2007)
- [11] L. Erdős. Universality of Wigner random matrices: a survey of recent results. *Russ. Math. Surv.* **66**(3), 507. (2011)
- [12] L. Erdős, B. Farrell, Local eigenvalue density for general MANOVA matrices. arXiv:1207.0031v2.
- [13] L. Erdős, A. Knowles, H.-T. Yau, and J. Yin. Spectral statistics of Erdos-Renyi graphs I: Local Semicircle law, arXiv: 1103. 1919. (2011)
- [14] L. Erdős, A. Knowles, H.-T. Yau, and J. Yin. Spectral statistics of Erdos-Renyi graphs II: eigenvalue spacing and the extreme eigenvalues. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **314**(3), 587-640. (2012)
- [15] L. Erdős, B. Schlein, H.-T. Yau. Semicircle law on short scales and delocalization of eigenvectors for Wigner random matrices. *Ann. Probab.* **37**(3), 815-852. (2009)
- [16] L. Erdős, B. Schlein, H.-T. Yau. Local Semicircle Law and Complete Delocalization for Wigner Random Matrices. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **287**(2), 641-655. (2009)
- [17] L. Erdős, B. Schlein, H.-T. Yau. Wegner Estimate and Level Repulsion for Wigner Random Matrices. *Int. Math. Res. Notices*, 2010(3): 436-479. (2010)
- [18] L. Erdős, B. Schlein, H.-T. Yau. Universality of random matrices and local relaxation flow. *Inventiones mathematicae*, **185**(1), 75-119. (2011)
- [19] L. Erdős, B. Schlein, H.-T. Yau, and J. Yin. The local relaxation flow approach to universality of the local statistics for random matrices. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **48**(1), 1-46. (2012)
- [20] L. Erdős, H.-T. Yau, and J. Yin. Universality for generalized Wigner matrices with Bernoulli distribution. arXiv: 1003.3813v7. (2011)
- [21] L. Erdős, H.-T. Yau, and J. Yin. Bulk universality for generalized Wigner matrices. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **154**, Issue 1-2, 341-407. (2012)
- [22] L. Erdős, H.-T. Yau, and J. Yin. Rigidity of eigenvalues of generalized Wigner matrices. *Advances in Mathematics*, **229**, Issue 3, 1435-1515. (2012)
- [23] P.L. Hsu. On the distribution of roots of certain determinantal equations. *Ann. Eugenics*, **9**, 250-258. (1939)
- [24] D. Féral, S. Péché. The largest eigenvalues of sample covariance matrices for a spiked population: Diagonal case. *J. Math. Phys.* **50**, 073302. (2009)
- [25] K. Johansson. Shape fluctuations and random matrices. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **209**, No. 2, 437-476. (2000)

- [26] I.M. Johnstone. On the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in principal components analysis. *Ann. Statist.* **29**, No. 2, 2953-27. (2001)
- [27] V.A. Marčenko, L.A. Pastur. Distribution for some sets of random matrices. *Math. USSR-Sb.*, **1**, 457-483. (1967)
- [28] A. Onatski. The Tracy-Widom limit for the largest eigenvalues of singular complex Wishart matrices. *Ann. Applied Probab.* **18** (2), 470-490. (2008)
- [29] S. Péché. Universality results for the largest eigenvalues of some sample covariance matrix ensembles. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **143**(3), 481-516. (2009)
- [30] N.S. Pillai, J. Yin, Universality of covariance matrices. *arXiv:1110.2501v6*.
- [31] N.S. Pillai, J. Yin, Universality of correlation matrices. *Annals of Statistics*, **40**(3), 1737-1763. (2012)
- [32] J.W. Silverstein, S.I. Choi, Analysis of the limiting spectral distribution of large dimensional random matrices. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **54**, 175-192. (1995)
- [33] A. Soshnikov. A note on universality of the distribution of the largest eigenvalues in certain sample covariance matrices. *Jour. Stat. Phys.* **108**(5), 1033-1056. (2002)
- [34] T. Tao, V. Vu. Random matrices: Universality of local eigenvalue statistics. *Acta Mathematica*, **206**(1), 127-204. (2011)
- [35] T. Tao, V. Vu. Random covariance matrices: Universality of local statistics of eigenvalues. *Ann. Probab.* **40**(3), 1285-1315. (2012)
- [36] C.A. Tracy, H. Widom. Level-spacing distributions and the Airy kernel. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **159**, No. 1, 151-174. (1994)
- [37] C.A. Tracy, H. Widom. On orthogonal and symplectic matrix ensembles. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **177**, No. 3, 727-754. (1996)
- [38] Y.Q. Yin. Limiting spectral distribution for a class of random matrices. *J. Multiv. Anal.*, **20**, 50-68. (1986)
- [39] K. Wang. Random covariance matrices: Universality of local statistics of eigenvalues up to the edge. *Random matrices: Theory and Applications*, **1**(1), 1150005. (2012)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ZHEJIANG UNIVERSITY, P. R. CHINA
E-mail address: zhigangbao@zju.edu.cn

DIVISION OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL AND MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES,
 NANYANG TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY, SINGAPORE 637371
E-mail address: gmp@ntu.edu.sg

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS AND APPLIED PROBABILITY, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE,
 SINGAPORE 117546
E-mail address: stazw@nus.edu.sg